ZKF

Woolworth

THE CATHEDRAL

IN THE

AMERICAN CHURCH.

BY

JAMES M. WOOLWORTH, LL.D.,
CHANCELLOR OF THE DIOCESE OF NEBRASKA.

"*It is no true reverence to follow up old lines without extending them. They give dignity if we know how to develop them; but if we will not step beyond them on vital call, we make trammels for ourselves, and are most unlike those old founders whom we propose to imitate.*"—ARCHBISHOP BENSON, 1877.

NEW YORK:
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY,
39 WEST 23d STREET.
1883.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

ROBERT HARPER CLARKSON, D. D., LL. D.,

BISHOP OF NEBRASKA,

THESE PAGES, THE RESULT OF READING BEGUN

AT HIS INSTANCE

AND WRITTEN IN AID OF HIS CATHEDRAL AND

ITS ORGANIZATION,

ARE INSCRIBED

WITH EVERY SENTIMENT OF DUTIFUL

RESPECT AND AFFECTION.

PREFACE.

When organizing his Cathedral Chapter in Nebraska, Bishop Clarkson called upon the writer of this little book for help. In advocacy of the scheme which was presented to the council of the diocese for its adoption the undersigned wrote a report of a committee raised for considering the subject, going over it somewhat more fully and particularly than is common in such papers. This circumstance has led several Bishops from time to time, as they have had the organization of the Cathedral of their dioceses in contemplation, to advise with the writer. In this way he has been led to see a want of information on this subject, and that it is not readily accessible. In England many valuable and interesting books on the Cathedral have within this generation been published, and in our country a considerable number of papers in explanation and advocacy of the institution have been printed in periodicals and pamphlets. Every one who wishes to possess himself of the whole subject ought to read them all. But it certainly will be convenient that information on the subject should be collected within the thin covers of

this little book. This has led the writer to undertake the task of preparing it.

Having made this explanation, it may be right for him to state something of the way in which he has executed it. He has not indulged the least hesitancy in the freest use of what others have said. He has adopted their words when they have answered his purpose, and their great names seemed to add authority to their opinions; and he has appropriated their views when for any reason, such as brevity, he could not quote their language. He wishes here in this general way to disclaim all originality or pretense of it. At the same time, when the conditions of our country and generation have come into view he has expressed his own opinion with reference to them.

Many matters which might well be given a place in a book on the subject have been passed over; others which might well be given a large place have been only touched upon. This has been necessary in the writer's view of the practical usefulness of the book. He has thought that next to such a book being written it was most desirable that it should be small. He hopes, however, that it may suggest to the interested reader more than is written out at length.

J. M. W.

Omaha, May, 1883.

CONTENTS.

I.

INTRODUCTORY.

IN the scheme upon which the American Church was organized the Cathedral had no place. It was looked upon by the men who had in hand the work of framing that scheme, as unsuited to the circumstances in which they found themselves. It was a hundred years ago, lacking two; and just after they had won for the nation its recognition by the mother country. The struggle had been long and hard; and it left behind active and bitter prejudices against whatever was thought to be purely English. The Cathedral was known only as an English institution, and not at all as of ancient origin or practical value. Besides this, the sentiment of the people was intensely democratic. In politics and in society, whatever savored of a system of government or mode of

organization in which every individual member of the constituencies was not the equal of every other was reprobated. The right of the Episcopate itself was questioned, and the Church which accepted it was distrusted by the general opinion; and that, too, though the function was much depressed. The Cathedral was looked upon as the luxurious appendage of the Establishment in a monarchical government whose dignitaries arrogated to themselves rank and power. And in addition to all this, there was wanting the pecuniary means which were supposed to be necessary to the maintenance of an institution which was associated with wealth and self-indulgent ease.

Even if the little body of churchmen who met in the first conventions did not all sympathize with the common prejudices, and were not imperfectly informed of the essential nature of this institution, as we are justified in assuming from the records which they left behind them of their action and opinions, it is certain that they felt themselves constrained by the circumstances to frame the constitu-

tion of the Church upon principles and a plan which did not provide a place for the Cathedral.

And for generations it seems not to have entered into the mind of any one, or if the subject engaged the thoughts of any, certainly no attempt was made, to graft the Cathedral upon the Church as it was first organized. For seventy years it continued to be regarded as alien to our system. In the course of that time prejudices against the old enemy were mollified: the Church of England began to be venerated as the Mother Church: the Episcopate recovered to a good degree its precedence and power: the history of the Catholic Church began to be understood and its lessons were pondered and appropriated: American churchmen in goodly numbers every year were visiting the old country and enjoying the beauty and majesty and solemn religious atmosphere of the Cathedrals there. And yet no one conceived the idea, or at any rate gave it emphatic expression, that in this American soil such institutions could be planted, or that in this American Church

they could find either use, support, or toleration.

About thirty years ago, however, an attempt in this direction was made. Not long after he was sent out to California, Bishop Kip essayed the task of introducing the Cathedral. All he did was to place his Episcopal chair in Grace Church of San Francisco and call it his Cathedral. He did this by no authority but his right as Rector of the Parish; and when his incumbency ceased the name of Cathedral ceased with it. He afterwards held the Rectorship of the Church of the Advent, and there set up his Episcopal seat, and gave its edifice the same name; and withdrew both when he resigned the position.

But this good came of it. Attention was drawn to the subject, and inquiry began to be made whether what our fathers had rejected and what had generally been set aside as unsuited to the circumstances of the Church in this land, was not entitled to consideration. That happened which is very apt to happen in the case of a truth long neglected or an

institution long ignored. Several thoughtful and learned men in different parts of the country, at the same time and without concert, began to consider the question. They did not content themselves with simply studying the organization, functions and work of English Cathedrals at that time, but pressed their examinations with urgency and rigor, on the one hand, into the insufficiency of an unattached Episcopate to fully exercise its function, and on the other into the history of the Cathedral in the days of the primitive Church and the early English Church as the complement of the function of the Bishop.

The result was that, coming to the publication of their views, they set forth in several interesting, valuable and learned papers what seemed to them defects in the organism of the Church, and the adequacy and aptness of the rejected institution to supply them. Then came Bishop Whitehouse's powerful advocacy by which the mind of the Church was greatly informed and moved. Following this was the erection by Bishop Whipple of his noble church, at Fari-

bault; and soon afterwards Bishop Lee began to build his Bishop's Church which he consecrated as Grace Cathedral at Davenport, and Bishop Neeley built St. Luke's at Portland. More recently the organizations at Milwaukee, Omaha, Albany, Reading, and in several of the missionary jurisdictions, with constitutions attempting to realize their purpose more thoroughly than had been proposed before, carried yet farther the question of the office, work, use and value of the Cathedral, as it might be made a factor in the American Church. And now, not less than twenty-five Cathedrals in different dioceses in widely separated parts of the country are every day challenging attention to the claims of institutions of their class.

It is quite true that many of them are organized upon a very slender foundation. They are nothing more than parish churches with the Bishop's chair set in the midst of the choir; very few have undertaken works beyond or other than what a large parish may carry on, and have not assumed any relations to the

administration of diocesan affairs. The organization of all of them is studiously declared by their founders to be tentative, and to be developed hereafter according to circumstances.

During the quarter of a century of efforts to engraft this institution upon the organization of the American Church this much of progress has been made; that to-day the Cathedral stands forth with just claims to a patient, intelligent, and unprejudiced hearing upon its competency to bring greater force, vigor and efficiency to the appliances heretofore in use to advance the Kingdom of Heaven upon the earth. And the question is the more present, practical and interesting, because enough has not yet been done to satisfy those who ask it and who are not to be put off by dignity of names and titles or by glittering generalities.

It cannot be doubted that the condition of English Cathedrals as they have been until lately, has withheld American churchmen from considering their value to the work they had

to do. Nor, on the other hand, can it be denied that the attention of thoughtful men here has been aroused by the many vigorous, anxious and pious efforts which have been making in the Mother Church to vindicate the right of these institutions to be and to make them of practical service. What has been done, written and said on one side of the Atlantic and on the other, furnishes a mass of most interesting and attractive learning, of which the intelligent and devout churchman here ought to desire to have some information.

When an institution to which the people are unused presents itself to them, and claims recognition and adoption into the social economy, it is bound to give an account of itself. Simply because it demands a place in the ways of men and desires to make trial of itself in the public service, it has no right to expect, and it is not likely to gain acceptance. It must be ready to explain what it is and what it can do. It must prove its legitimacy by a descent traced from some approved order of things in the past, or justify itself by its fitness to supply

some defect or inadequacy of prevalent modes, or show that it embodies a truth which needs new emphasis in popular belief and new exemplification in social methods. It has no right to unsettle what has been tried and found sufficient, what has become familiar to the people and upon which habits and traditions have been formed, and around which affections cluster, unless it can set forth the way in which, if it have a chance, it will yield a better service or the same service at less cost of energy or money than what it will supplant or modify. Change from what men are wonted to is seldom altogether good: if it be not from bad to good, or from good to something better, it is positively bad.

And more than this: an institution presenting itself to society and asking recognition and acceptance, cannot wholly commend itself to the public intelligence by simply showing that, viewed abstractly, it is better than the existing order. The question is hardly ever simply the merits of the claimant, or even its superiority to received methods. If

that were so, society would be in a constant ferment over theories: the doctrinaire would be the true philosopher. The candidate for a place in the social economy must go farther in its apology; and show that in its nature, methods and necessary relations it is suited to the exigencies in which it is to operate. It may be ever so good in itself, venerable with the hoar of age, or beneficent, graceful and politic elsewhere, yet if it be alien to the conditions in which it claims a place, if it cannot assimilate with the circumstances and become acclimated to the atmosphere in which it must flourish, if it is to thrive at all, then it must be rejected of men. The settled order cannot be wholly reconstructed simply for its sake.

The proposition to graft the Cathedral upon the organism of the American Church must submit to be tried by these practical, searching and rigorous tests. It must inform churchmen of its nature. Tracing its lineage from the ancient days, it must show that it has been found to be an essential, or, if not an

essential, at least a general, permanent and valuable part of the polity of the Catholic Church. It is not enough that it bears a sonorous name, that it holds a dignified position in the Mother Church of England, that noble and generous associations cluster around it: it must point out a vacant place in the economy of the daughter in America, and demonstrate its capacity to fill it, and, in the conditions, circumstances and exigencies of these times and this land, yield a service and do a work of special, substantial, certain, positive good.

And the stress in the advocacy is the more severe because of the history of the American Church. A hundred years ago the number of her members and of her parishes was so small as to be insignificant among the multitudes who called themselves Christians. As we have before said, with traditions those of a hierarchy and with relations to the Establishment of England, her polity seemed alien to the institutions of the country and contrariant to the popular sentiment. From such

small beginnings, and from the midst of such untoward circumstances she has won her way to the first place of influence and service among religious bodies and in society. The increase of her numbers has exceeded that of any of the Protestant denominations: her works of charity shed a flood of benevolence upon all the populations: she has attracted the largest proportion of the intelligence, piety and zeal in the cities, and she has penetrated the remotest settlements on the frontier. All this she has done without the Cathedral. It may well be asked if she has been competent to such achievements, why is she not equal to the exigencies that are before her in her future career?

Profoundly grateful for the past and rejoicing in it exceedingly, the advocates of the Cathedral may safely accept the challenge, and enter upon the attempt to prove that she is fit to render to the Church a most efficient service in the spread of the Gospel among men.

Before proceeding to our task, it may be

worth while to say that we assume that our readers accept the theory of Apostolic Episcopacy with all that the term implies; that is to say, that the Church was constituted by our divine Lord with the three orders of bishops, priests and deacons; that even in this our day the first trace their succession from the apostles, and the others derive their authority from them; and that this polity and this lineal descent and authority is necessary to every branch of the Catholic Church. We do not suppose that those who do not accept this theory will be interested in the discussion. This being premised, it is hardly necessary to say that the claim in behalf of the Cathedral is not that it is essential to the complete constitution of a true branch of the Catholic Church. We have seen that such is not the fact by our own case. And what is true with us is equally true of many of the churches of the English Colonies, where, as we shall presently see, the Cathedral does not exist at all or exists only in name. And the same may be said with equal truth of many

of the vicariates or missionary districts of the Romish Church. It cannot be pretended for a moment that the institution under consideration is of divine origin or essential character. All that can be claimed is that in the administration of the Episcopal function, it has been found to be, and is by its nature well fitted to be, the complement of that office.

There cannot be a Church without a Bishop: there can be a Bishop, a diocese and a Church without a Cathedral: but what we shall endeavor to show is that the Bishop can best govern his Church and administer his function by the aid of his Cathedral.

II.

HISTORICAL.

IT is not easy to understand the modes in which the early Church spread itself through the world, without apprehending the nature of the social and political organizations of the times. A word at the outset may be allowed to its explanation. Society was urban: the political organization was municipal. Greece especially, and Italy also were full of towns. From any lofty peak, the observer could look down on the territory lying before him and see many cities at a glance. Within limits hardly wider than one of our counties, and among a people one in blood, language, manners, and religion, he could, in a short day's journey, pass through several capitals; and as one receded from his view,

another rose before him, so that all the whole distance his vision was full of the mighty walls, the glorious architecture, and the teeming life of some metropolis. The fact that the people were congregated in the cities is but a fraction of the truth. It was to his city that the citizen turned with the enthusiastic affection of home. A man's country was not a region, but a city: his patriotism did not extend over a wide surface of territory, but was shut up within the walls of a single town. His countrymen were not a whole nation of the same blood and language as himself, but only those who shared with him the local burghership of his native place. A man, in short, was not a Greek or an Italian, but an Athenian or a Roman. The city was the ruling political conception, and the form of political life was municipal. The freedman, the foreigner, even the dependent ally could not obtain citizenship by residence or even by birth in the land. He only who was the descendant of citizen-ancestors could be enfranchised except by special decree of the

whole body of citizens. To live at a distance from the city, so that it was impossible to appear habitually at the assemblage held within the walls was felt to be equivalent to a sentence of exile. And they whose homes were thus remote were reckoned as lost to the citizenship, and as of an inferior and contemned race. Nor was this true only of Greece and Italy. All the provinces of imperial Rome were full of great cities. Gibbon tells us of the twelve hundred cities of Gaul, whose southern provinces simulated the wealth and elegance of Italy. He quotes Pliny as his authority for numbering those of Spain as three hundred and sixty. Three hundred acknowledged the authority of Carthage; which capital rose under the emperors with new splendor from its ashes, and recovered all the advantages which can be separated from independent sovereignty. Under the reign of the Cæsars, the proper Asia alone contained five hundred populous cities, enriched with all the gifts of nature and adorned with all the refinement of art. The capitals of Syria and

Egypt held still a superior rank in the empire. Antioch and Alexandria looked down with disdain on a crowd of dependent cities, and yielded with reluctance to the majesty of Rome itself.

One other fact remains to be noted. Within the walls of each of these cities were the schools of philosophy, the political assembly, the sharp activities of commerce, the glorious works of art, and the magnificent temples and the worship of the gods. They who lived in the midst of all this urban culture, excitement and strife could but grow in mental vigor, sensitiveness of spirit, and eagerness for what was new. On the other hand, they who were shut out and condemned to the drudgery of daily and endless toil, born to labor, and with children doomed to the same hard lot, grew with the years and the generations more and more stolid; clinging unreasoningly to the past, and unready to adopt what was unwonted and new.

When they to whom the august command was given to go into all the world and preach

the Gospel to every creature, set about its obedience, they followed of necessity the lines on which they found society organized. They passed through the fields and villages and the scanty and stolid populations there into the city. They did so because here the multitudes were gathered. The simple fact of numbers brought them here. And these multitudes, by education, culture, refinement, and long, daily and anxious reasoning about the soul, its nature and destiny, had outgrown the mythology of their fathers, and were ready to hear, heed and accept a new solution of the mysteries of life, death, and immortality. To whom but to these populations, unsatisfied by the guesses of philosophers confessing their ignorance by altars to the unknown God and in their impotence seeking after the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him,—to whom of all men but these wandering, anxious, troubled souls could the revelation of the Gospel be first brought? But an itinerant Apostleship, that blessed one city for a little while, and then, before what there had

been won was well assured, was under the necessity of passing on to another, was unequal to the exigencies. Nor could Bishops with jurisdiction over a wide region in which were many cities accomplish the task. We have seen that each of these cities was a whole country unto its citizens, and commanded of them a patriotism as enthusiastic and narrow as the love of home. A local, stationary, resident, and municipal Episcopate was the only institution which could effectually work upon such populations. A Bishop of Greece or Italy was impossible. The autonomy of a Church in each city was a necessity by reason of the nature of every municipality.

This preliminary but essential fact being explained, we may go on to inquire how the actual work was conducted. The way of it was what we should expect. Going to his own city, the Bishop established himself in a certain place of residence and ministration. Here he gathered about him his priests and deacons in numbers according to circumstances; all living together, their hearts aflame

with a common zeal, their intense activities devoted to a common work. They were all ruled by the Bishop as the head of the community and fountain of authority. Here with the aid of those he trusts he lays out the work, apportioning it among his clergy, and allotting to each his task and sending him on his peculiar mission. Almost may we see him now standing on the steps of the altar in the light of the early morning, his priests and deacons, workers and converts all about him, and hear him send them forth with some such words as ours in the hymn,

> "Oft in danger, oft in woe,
> Onward Christians, onward go."

Only, to the little company of eager and heroic souls it is not a mere sentiment, but a very real fight he bids them to, and to an almost present victory of martyrdom he cheers them on.

They go into the streets and markets and schools and houses and to the very doors of the temples of the gods they would cast down.

They arrest any who will be detained by the story of the Crucified; and beg, persuade and constrain him to listen to the new doctrine. They bring one and another home to the Bishop, who teaches these wondering souls in the mysteries of the strange faith, ministers to the distress of their spirits, baptizes them at the font, confirms them in their vows, and receives them at the altar.

Nor is this all that goes on in these sacred precincts. These missionaries come to the Holy Father with their reports of what, out in the world, they have seen and heard and done and tried to do. He learns from them of movements of the people, the policies of the government, the feelings of the higher classes, whether they incline to the cause or threaten it with violence. He plans measures to meet each overture, whether of friendliness or malice. And, alike if it be storm or sunshine without, he keeps calm and sacred this common home of all his people; where all the ways of all their work begin and end; whither after all toils and dangers

and persecutions they turn their weary feet for rest and their weary hearts for solace; and where is the altar at which as the High Priest their Bishop offers the holy sacrifice. That home was in those days the Cathedral. It was not only the first Church in order of time; it held a primacy among all the institutions of the Christian State and was the focus of all the work of all the diocese.

The above account is generally applicable to Asia, Africa and southern Europe. In Saxon England the circumstances were somewhat different. There were few towns. The population was sparsely scattered over the country. Each family with its branches and dependents living by itself held wide tracts of land and much of the country lay vacant. The people were devoted to agriculture and pasturage. Their manners were rude and simple, and they were disinclined to the exactions of compact society. The polity was loose and easy; the country was divided among many tribes, with indefinite, democratic constitutions. Each had its king, but he was

king in little else than name, except for purposes of defense and war.

The organization of the Church consisted with that of the society and the State. The Bishop entering upon the work of converting a tribe fixed his seat, his bishopstool as it was called, at any convenient place of his choice and with no regard to population. Sometimes, as for instance at Ely, he planted it by itself in a vacant region; the religious colony afterwards drawing the people around it. Accordingly he was the Bishop not of a city but of a tribe. This is illustrated by his style. On the continent, as we have seen, the Episcopate, consistent with the structure of society and of the civil polity, was urban, and the Bishops were called after their city, as the Bishop of Jerusalem, of Antioch, of Rome. On the Island, on the other hand, society being rural and the polity tribal, the Episcopate accordingly was rural and the Bishops took their style from their people. For instance, there was a tribe called the Somersaetas, from which the name Somerset comes. The Bishop

whose seat was at Wells, was the Bishop not of Wells but of the Somersaetas. There was also the tribe of the West Saxons who had the royal city of Winchester. Their Bishop was not the Bishop of Winchester but of the West Saxons.

But however interesting this difference in circumstances, the work in Britain was the same as eleswhere and was carried on in the same way. The Bishop going into a wide territory, among a rude tribe, made choice of the place where he should live and whence he and his helpers should carry on their work. Here he built the Church, houses, gardens, farms and all necessary conveniences for his clerical colony. Here he gathered about him his priests and deacons in considerable numbers, giving them homes in his own houses and supporting them from his revenues. The life was not necessarily celibate, nor under one roof nor at one table; but it was in community. He was the head of the family and he ruled it as an abbot his monastery. He apportioned the work among his clergy, giv-

ing to each his place, office and task. To this one he gave this circuit to travel in the country of the tribe, and to another that: to one he appointed this station or mission and to another that; and so on through all the work of the diocese. Among the rude and scattered population, the service was more desultory than it was in the midst of the intense life of the thronged city, but there was the same vigor, the same discipline, the same brave and eager spirit which was never wearied by toil nor daunted by danger or persecution. As the work was the same among the rural people of Britain as among the urban population of Greece and Italy, namely, their conversion to the cross, so too the manner of it was the same, namely, the Bishop and his clergy collected in one community and home, about one altar, and thence going forth among those to whom they were sent. The sphere of duty whose center was here embraced all ministrations, charities, instructions, and interests; and the service which went forth hence was circumscribed only by the boun-

daries of the whole diocese. For four centuries this was the polity of the Church. Everywhere the Bishop was the fountain of authority, alike where society was urban and he was the Bishop of a city, and where it was rural and he was the Bishop of a tribe. He gathered his clergy about him in a great center: from thence he sent them forth, thither they returned: their goings and comings, their work and their life ever under his direct, personal, particular direction. This center was the Cathedral, and this polity was the diocesan system.

The first step of departure from the diocesan system was taken one way on the Continent, and another in England. Let that step be first traced in the cities of Southern Europe, Asia and Africa. When the work was well advanced within the walls the Bishop sent his clergy into the dependent region. We have already remarked the character of the people there. For generations, bent to toil and shut out of the means of education, they were slow, stolid, tenacious of what

they were used to, and unready for what was new to them. This showed itself in their conversion: they were content with the faith of their fathers. The worship of Jupiter and Juno, Venus, Mercury, and the other gods, satisfied the needs of their dull hearts, and the old mythology answered all their inquiries after the life beyond death. The work of their conversion was hard, slow: it had none of the excitement and vivacity of the city. The first measures in their behalf were desultory and irregular. The manner of it was on this wise. From time to time, as occasion offered, and as the other work allowed, men were sent out from the city to declare the message of the Gospel to these dull ears and heedless minds. Very little impression was made for a long time. The least vigorous and successful of the missions to the heathen in our day make their way much more rapidly. Indeed, long after the cities had accepted the new faith, the country clung to the old, so that the name of the rural people, *pagani*, came to have the meaning of our word pagan.

When at last Christianity was proclaimed by Constantine, and the country people almost by constraint submitted to the new doctrine, the work was carried on among them with more method. The Bishop sent his men out to them weekly or daily, and kept the communication open. When converts in some numbers were gathered at one point, so that it was inconvenient to reach them and supply their needs from the city, excursions were abandoned, and the Bishop appointed one or more of his clergy to remain among them. The passing to and fro between the station and the Cathedral kept going on, and their relations were the closest: the clergy returning frequently to the Bishop to report their progress, receive directions, and be relieved by others. He still directed the work of each and the method of it. But after a time these relations were relaxed. The priest appointed to a mission held his place longer and longer, came into the city less frequently, formed local attachments, and at last made his permanent home there. Meanwhile, within the walls the

Church, its people, worship, charities, and relations to society and the government grew to such proportions as to absorb the time and thoughts of the Bishop. He no longer attended personally to the wants of the missions, and relaxed his supervision of them. This went on farther and farther, until he preserved little more than a visitorial power over them. At first there grew up independence; then there was isolation. Left altogether to themselves the priest and his people assumed to own all the property and to have rights separate and corporate of their own. Instead of one society with the Bishop at its head directing the work, leading the worship, and administering all the affairs of the diocese at the one Cathedral, another detached, independent, isolated society grew up which was a corporation apart from other bodies and altogether competent to all its own needs. This was a parish.

It must not be supposed that the parish is peculiarly a rural institution. The same process by which it grew up in the country

was also going on in the city. When Christianity became the religion of the people, the Cathedral could not contain the multitudes which thronged its courts. Churches in various parts of the city were built. By the relics of the saints, the sanctity of their priests, and the learning of their doctors they drew to themselves the veneration of the people. Their dependence upon the Cathedral was impracticable for many reasons; and soon, though they were within the walls of the city, they too became separate, independent, isolated corporations.

And yet in the midst of all this new growth the Cathedral remained the center of the diocesan administration and service; having a precedence of all churches because it was the Bishop's seat, and relations which no other church could share. Indeed one of the most astonishing facts in history is the universal prevalence in all parts of the Catholic Church until the last century of this institution.

Let us trace now the first step of departure from the purely diocesan system as it was

taken in England. This step was not directly to the parochial system. The polity of the Church passed through an intermediate process before the local organism was developed. This, like most other changes, grew out of the circumstances of society. When the people of Britain were brought from paganism into the Church, the business of ministering to their spiritual wants became excessive. We have seen that the populations were sparsely scattered over a wide region; it was therefore inconvenient to reach all the people of the diocese from the one Cathedral. To meet these conditions, religious communities were planted in the different parts of the diocese. Each of these societies built its Church, as large and imposing as its means allowed and not infrequently as grand as the Cathedral. Its members numbered from ten or a dozen to fifty; their life was in community, although not necessarily monastic. To each a district was allotted, with cure of souls therein, and with right to tithes and church-dues from all the inhabitants. From this their home, they radiated through the region com-

mitted to them, carrying their ministrations from house to house and from family to family, and conducting their work in all respects as the Bishop and his clergy had carried on theirs at and from the Cathedral. These Churches were the Minsters of England, and this was the minster system. The scheme was like that of associate missions in our Church conceived, explained, and advocated in many earnest and learned papers, but never realized in any large and permanent way. Those who have given themselves the pleasure of reading the life of Doctor Breck, lately published, may, from his plans for the Nashotah and Seabury Missions, gain a vivid conception of the essence of the English Minster. The Cathedral and the Minster were both missionary establishments, having a considerable number of clergy, who went forth from their common home into the region round about, and generally carrying on the same work in the same way. Their systems differed in this: there was one Cathedral in the diocese, with the Bishop at its head: there were several minsters in

one diocese, each with a dean or abbot at its head.

The first relaxation of the minster-system in England was the concession which was made in the tenth century, that a thane who had a Church with a burial place, might pay one third of his tithe to his own Church and the other two thirds to the Minster; but if he had a Church without a burial place (a chapel, as we should now call it) he must support his clerk himself. The clerk by degrees acquired a shrift district, perhaps influenced or determined by the extent of the thane's territory.

Archdeacon Stopford thus described the manner in which the Minsters were gradually supplanted by the parochial clergy.

"The decline of the minster system is difficult to be traced but easy to be conceived. Once it was granted that thanes might have the privilege of burial for their own Churches, it was inevitable, except under strong restraint, that a new and powerful interest should grow up in rivalry to the Minsters;

and when that was working, the Norman Bishops came in with the strong desire to convert the ancient Minsters into 'regular' monasteries, such as had already grown up abroad. For this purpose it was necessary to divest the minsters of the cure of souls. It was in the power of the Norman Bishops to promote the change by a popular measure, most accordant with the policy of the conquerors, of granting the right of burial to every thane's Church. Such a method would inevitably accomplish the result; and yet would leave no record behind except the result. No record but the result remains. The ancient minsters became 'regular' monasteries, withdrawn alike from the cure of souls and the jurisdiction of the Bishop; and the thane's clerks became the parochial and diocesan clergy."

From this sketch of the history of early Christianity, framed in order to display to view the place which the Cathedral held in the work of converting the heathen, and its relations to the Bishop, the clergy and the

diocese, we pass now to a matter somewhat more nearly related to our subject: the constitution, namely, by which the clergy of the Cathedral were associated and their affairs administered. While the Bishop and clergy of each of these institutions framed and enjoyed statutes of their own enactment, there was a powerful and well understood system of law, —what we may call common law, which these statutes could not contravene, and could modify only in some particulars. This explains the fact of the similarity of the organization and administration of all cathedrals throughout the Catholic Church before the Reformation.

Our present purpose is with the common features of these institutions, and not with what may be peculiar to any one of them. And it is of the constitutions of these bodies as they were fixed and settled after the parish had become a recognized and most important institution, that is to say, in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and their vicissitudes afterwards down to our own times, rather than with what they were and what

they did in the earlier times, that we now shall speak.

The distinctive title of the cathedral clergy is "Canon." It is from the same Latin word, taken in the sense of a list or catalogue of articles or persons. It was the custom to put up in the porch of the church a tablet on which the names of its clergy were inscribed. By a process common in the growth of language, the name of this list or catalogue of the priests of the cathedral was given to them, and they were called Canons. Other explanations of the derivation of the word have been given, but this seems the most natural. It came into use in the sixth century.

The number of the Canons was different in different cathedrals and at different times. There seem to have been at Wells in the tenth century only four or five, in the twelfth at first ten and then twenty-two; afterwards the number was raised to fifty. At St. Paul's, London, there were thirty, and at Lincoln, fifty-two.

For a long time and until perhaps the mid-

dle of the eighth century, all the estates of the Church were held together; and all of the clerical body, the Bishops, the Canons, and all the other clergy were supported out of the common funds. These estates and funds were often spoken of as belonging to the Bishop. Thus at the council of Tours in 813 "the Canons and clerks of the cities" are spoken of as "dwelling in the Bishops' houses;" and it is provided that "food and clothing they are to receive according to the means of the Bishop." The Canons lived in community, with the Bishop at their head as the primary and active authority. This however does not mean that they lived in common: in England until at or very near the conquest each lived in his own house, and often he was married. But devoted to the same life, drawing their support from one treasury, and subject to the government of the Bishop, they formed what we may call a close corporation. After a time and speaking generally we may say in the twelfth century, the revenues of the churches being very considerably increased,

the number of the Canons enlarged, and the duties of the Bishop various and engrossing, the estates of the Cathedral were gradually partitioned between them. The Bishop took to himself certain of them for his own use and administration, and left others to the Canons. He remained the active head of the body, vigorously and personally ruling it; but they no longer lived in his houses and out of his supplies; they had homes, a treasury and an administration of their own. It was the first step, and a natural step to take as the society began to become complex, in that long course of development which ended in the isolation of the Episcopate and the Cathedral.

Then another step was taken in the same direction. Just as the common estates of the Church were divided between the Bishop and the Canons, the estates which had been assigned to the society of the Canons were again divided into two parts: one part consisted of the common estates which were appropriated to the expenses of the general establishment;

the other part consisted of the other estates which were divided among the Canons, each individually having and holding his own separate from his brethren. For instance, the Canons of Wells had, say four estates, A, B, C, and D. They retained the estate A as the property of the society for the common use and benefit; and they set the estate B apart by itself for one Canon; they set the estate of C apart for another Canon, and they set the estate of D apart for a third Canon. A Canon as a member of the body had an interest in the estate A in common with his brethren, and he also held the estate B separate for his own individual use and benefit. He was a member of the Cathedral corporation and as such enjoyed the corporate estates; and he was a corporation by himself and as such held his separate estate and applied its rents and profits to his personal use and benefit. On these separate estates there were a Church, a schoolhouse for the people of the township in which the benefice was situated, and a house for the

residence of the Canon. It was the duty of the Canon holding the benefice to see to it that services were held in the Church and instruction given in the schoolhouse. He could do this either personally, living in his house and himself ministering and teaching on his estates; or he could employ another priest to do so for him. But in one way or the other he was bound to provide for his people. This duty was just as imperative as that which he owed to the Cathedral. These estates were called prebends from the Latin *præbenda*, from *præbere* a contraction of *præhibere* which is made up of *præ* and *habere*. The holder of them was called a Prebendary. A Canon thus held a double office and had a double duty: he was a member of the Cathedral body and owed a duty to the Cathedral, and he held the separate benefice and owed a duty to the dependent population. The titles Canon and Prebendary are often applied indiscriminately. They are two titles of the same person; but accurately they describe two separate functions. The

style of Canon is the proper one when the Cathedral office is in view; the style of Prebendary when the parochial office is referred to.

It was necessary that these great societies should have officers charged with special duties. In the early Church there was one Presbyter called Primicerius, who by reason of age, piety or wisdom was placed over others of his order, just as the Archdeacon was of the lowest order of the ministry and was over all the other deacons. The principal officer of the cathedral body after the Bishop was the successor of the Primicerius, and was called the Dean. Dean Milman in his Annals of St. Paul's, London, (p. 132) thus defines his duties and office: "The Dean had supreme authority; was bound to defend the liberties of the Church; was bound by his oath to observe and to compel others from the Canons down to the lowest officers and servants to observe the laudable customs of the Church, to watch over all the possessions of the Church and to recover what might

have been lost or alienated. He had authority also over all who inhabited the manors and estates; an authority which singularly combined the seignorial and spiritual jurisdictions. He was the guardian at once of the rights and interests of the poorer tenants, and, it may also be said, vassals, as well as of their morals and religion. The Dean presided in all causes brought before the Chapter and determined them, with the advice of the Chapter. He corrected, with the advice of the Chapter, all excesses and contumacies. Lighter offenses of inferior persons were punished by the Chancellor. The Bishop had no authority in capitular affairs, except on appeal. The Dean, for more heinous offenses, could expel from the choir, and cut off all stipends and emoluments, 'with discretion, to the edification, not the destruction, of the Church. These words are in Colet's unaccepted code; but the same spirit prevails throughout the older statutes, only in different forms. The Dean had a subdean to perform his functions, when abroad or incapacitated from duty, with

authority over all the inferior members of the Church, except the Canons."

Next in rank to the Dean was the Precentor, who had charge of the choir of the Cathedral and all the services which were performed in it, and the schools of music. He directed the music and had the discipline of all the choristers and singers. His deputy, where he had one, was called the Succentor.

Next after the Precentor came the Chancellor, who was charged with the care of the library, and the grammar and divinity schools. It was also his duty to lecture to the Cathedral clergy on divinity, and to organize theological instruction given by others. In some places, as at St. Paul's, he had "charge of education, not only for the church but for the whole city; all teachers of grammar are subject to him." His deputy was the Vice-Chancellor.

The last of the officers of the Chapter was the Treasurer. "The Treasurer was the responsible guardian of the treasures of the Church, and ample indeed they were. Rel-

iques, first in value and importance; books, of which there is a curious catalogue; vessels of gold and silver, vestments, chalices, crosses, curtains, cushions, palls. He was answerable to the Dean and Chapter for the safe custody of all these precious things, and could not lend any of them without the consent of the Dean and Chapter. Under the Treasurer was the Sacrist. His office was to superintend the tolling of the bells, to open the doors of the Church at the appointed times, to dress the altars, and take care that the vessels and vestments were clean and in good order. The Sacrist was to take care that there was in the Church, even on the festivals, no crowd, noise, nor singing, neither talking, quarrelling, nor jesting, neither business nor sleeping. He was to maintain order, and conduct every one to his proper place."

The manner of life in this society needs a word of explanation. The theory of it was always a life in common: it was not conventual but rather collegiate. At some Cathedrals the inclination was to the regular rule of the

monastic orders, and there were a common refectory, and a common dormitory; and there remain to this day the signs of a common kitchen, buttery, brewhouse, bake house and mill. At others no attempt seems to have been made towards the monastic rule, but the Deans and Canons always had their separate houses. In both however a freedom always obtained beyond that permitted to regulars.

We have seen that the Canons, and this term includes the dignitaries as well as the others, had duties to their Cathedral and their prebends, and incomes correspondingly derived. As was natural, some preferred to remain at their Cathedrals and devote themselves to their duties there: these discharged their prebendary duties by deputing them to vicars who filled the place of their principals and received a part of their incomes. Others preferred to go to their prebends and devote themselves to their duties there, leaving their parts in the Cathedral service to the others. The temptation to the latter course was strong. They who yielded to it enjoyed as Canons their full

share of the income of the common funds of the Cathedral body, and saved the expense of paying vicars to supply their places at their prebends. So sharp was this temptation, that finally almost all gave themselves to their duties as Prebends and left their duties as Canons undone, so that the Cathedrals were forsaken. It became necessary to contrive some device for bringing them back to the Cathedral. There were always some who resided there and gave themselves to the Cathedral; but he who turned a deaf ear to it was plied by an appeal to his sordid nature: it was made his pecuniary interest to reside. As we have seen he received the income of his parish, whether he came near the Cathedral or not. It was now ordered that no Canon should share in the division of the common property of the corporation in any year, unless he had kept a certain term of residence. Thus at Wells, in the thirteenth century, there was a daily distribution of bread and money among all those members of the Church from the Bishop downwards, who happened to be pres-

ent. The residue of the corporate revenue, after this and all other outgoings were paid, was divided at the end of the year among those who had kept the full term of residence; namely eight months in the case of a dignitary, and six in the case of an ordinary Canon. The amount of a Canon's income was thus made to depend on the length of his residence during each year. One who never came near the Cathedral could get nothing beyond the income of his own prebend. One who resided for a time less than six or eight months, besides the income of his prebend, had his share in the daily distribution for as many days as he happened to be present. One who resided his full term received his share of the daily distribution for the time that he resided,—for every day in the year if it so happened,—and he was also entitled to a share in the overplus of the corporate property at the end of a year. Thus the Canon who resided got a larger income than he who stayed away.

This change put an end to the evils of general non-residence; Canons were now as eager

to reside as they had formerly been to stay away. But this measure had another effect, perhaps not foreseen when it was adopted. The amount of the overplus divisable at the end of the year among those who resided the full term, depended of course upon the whole amount of residence of all the Canons; each receiving a share larger or smaller, not simply according to the time he resided, but also according to the time all of his brethren resided. It thus became the interest of those who made their home at the Cathedral to prevent others from coming thither and sharing their incomes. As the avarice of the clergy had been wrought on in order to induce residence, the same evil motive became active to prevent residence. A new device was now contrived for the purpose. Those who were already in possession of the houses and property of the Cathedral and on that ground claimed the right to regulate the matter, exacted of each Canon who came up a large payment before admitting him to residence: the sums so realized being applied partly to the Church, and

partly to extravagant entertainments of the clergy. These expenditures were so large as to thoroughly accomplish the purpose for which they were required; and most of the Canons were kept out of the close.

There was a good excuse for resorting to some measure regulating the matter. When it became the interest of the Canons to reside, there was no certainty who or how many would be at the Cathedral at any one time. At one time there might be more than enough, at another not enough to serve the Church and fill the houses. This state of things caused great inconvenience and confusion. Gradually a regular system was introduced by which the duty of residence was laid on a fixed number of Canons who alone were to discharge all the ordinary duties at the Cathedral on behalf of the whole body All others were excluded from the right of residence, and their attendance at the Cathedral was permitted only on special occasions. This gave rise to the distinction which we will have occasion to notice hereafter be-

tween Canons residentiary and Canons non-residentiary.

There was another body of the Cathedral clergy who cannot be passed over, namely, the Vicars. When non-residence became common it was required of each Canon that he provide a clergyman who should take his place in his absence; and the rule sprang up making it his duty to always have a deputy. Just as the Dean had his subdean, the Precentor his Succentor, and so on, each Canon had his deputy who was called his Vicar. There were therefore as many Vicars as there were Canons. When the Canons forsook the Cathedral for their prebends, the Vicars carried on the services and work perhaps as efficiently and decorously as those whom they represented. An old writer of those times seeking to show the superiority of the monks over the secular Canons says, that the former praise God with their mouths, the latter through their Vicars. There is a story of Thomas à Becket, when Archbishop of Canterbury, sending a man with a bull of excom-

munication against the Bishop of London, who went to St. Paul's Cathedral on Ascension Day and on that great festival found the officiating Priest to be neither Bishop, Dean, nor Canon, but only a Vicar. As each Vicar was appointed by a Canon to be his deputy, he looked upon him as his master. He was paid by his Canon and lived in his house. When his principal came into residence he gave place to him, seeking shelter where he could. But the Vicars of each Cathedral having common employment, interests and life were naturally drawn together. First, they acquired estates separate from those of the Canons; then they had houses of their own, dormitories, refectories, and chapels; at last unmarried and living a purely collegiate life they were formed into a college: so that as there was the corporation of the Dean and Canons, so there was a corporation of the Vicars. They were now no longer each the deputy of a Canon, but were the assistants of the residentiaries in the services and work of the Cathedral. Then a distinction came in; there

were Priest Vicars and Lay Vicars. But the latter were not merely singing men paid each as stipendiaries, but members of the college with equal rights with their clerical brethren.

There was also another office, that of the Archdeacon. It was diocesan. In England he was not a member of the Cathedral body, but in Italy he had his stall in the choir and seat in the Chapter.

We come now to notice the great society of the Cathedral. The Chapter was the corporation. It held the title to the property, alienated it and was impleaded in the courts of law. Its style was, the Dean and Chapter of such and such Cathedral Church, of such and such city: as the Dean and Chapter of St. Andrew's Cathedral Church of Wells; the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of the blessed Virgin St. Mary of Litchfield. Its corporate members were the Dean and Canons. At first all the Canons, those who were residents and those who were not, had equal rights of attending and speaking at

and voting in the Chapter. And to this day the case is the same at many Cathedrals, as for instance at York. When all are summoned the Chapter is called the Greater Chapter; when the residentiaries meet in the Chapter house the convention is called the lesser or hebdomidal Chapter. In some cathedrals, as at Wells, there is a broad distinction between the residentiaries and non-residentiaries. It was customary for the Dean to summon the latter to meetings of the Chapter only when a Bishop was to be elected. By and by the custom hardened into a law, by which they were excluded except on such occasions. And yet a non-resident was installed with the same ceremony as a resident; the formula is that he shall have "voice in Chapter and stall in choir;" and when he becomes a residentiary no new ceremony is had to invest him with the new office and dignity. In the case of the Bishop is the like inconsistency. When he is enthroned he is installed both in choir and Chapter house; he is presented to the chief seat in the latter, is

designated in the statutes as the principal head of the Chapter, and reverence is paid him in the choir. And yet unless he held a prebend he could not in his Episcopal capacity attend the meetings of the Chapter, except on special occasions and when visiting the Cathedral. The Vicars, Choristers and others of the Cathedral body were not members of the Chapter.

The institution had now become a highly organized body; theoretically it was as perfect as human ingenuity informed by large experience could contrive. There was first the central figure of the Bishop vested with the function of the Apostleship in the Church of God: the fountain of honor and authority. There was a body of clergy circling round him, who resided with him, and sustained him by their advice and services in his government of the diocese in all its various concerns, spiritual, educational, and charitable, and who carried on the constant and ornate worship of the temple. In the next circle was a larger body not in constant attendance at the Cathedral

but connected with it by official rank and occasional duty. Beyond these was ranged the great body of parochial clergy, by whom the banner of the Church and the cross of Christ was upheld in the midst of the people and the stress of the battle against the foe was well borne. The spectacle fills the vision of every churchman: he feels the strength of the vigorous body and he is thrilled with expectancy.

We saw at the outset of this sketch that the polity of the early Church was diocesan. There was the one Bishop, the source of all authority, and the one Cathedral, the seat of the administration of the whole *Dei Civitas*. He stood in the midst of his clergy who were gathered about him there, and personally, directly and specially ordered the whole and every part of the work throughout the whole city and dependent territory. All the priests, deacons, and lay helpers, men and women, went forth and returned as he commanded, and did what he set them to do. This was the purely diocesan system.

When the work outgrew the one center,

the parish sprang up. It was a separate, detached, and local institution. Subject at once to the visitation of the Bishop and the precedence of the Cathedral, it had a certain independence in the control of its own affairs, and was a center of work within its narrow boundaries. This was the parochial system.

It did not displace the Cathedral any more than the priest of the parish ousted the Bishop. The great central institution remained with the Bishop and its special body of clergy. Here, as the chief magistrate in his capital, he ruled his diocese. He did not do so personally and directly nor in the circumstances and details of administration, but he still held a general, temperate, active and vigorous sway. Nor was the Episcopal power arbitrary. The Bishop in his administration had the assistance of his Cathedral clergy. They were his council to advise him and relieved the burden of his office by their labors. This is the Cathedral system. It is the diocesan system, not pure and simple, but qualified by the parochial system.

We return now to our task of tracing the history of the institution.

As the Cathedral had come to perfection in its organization, through many changes which took place little by little and by a natural process, so now it had before it many vicissitudes. Indeed, when at the height of its development it carried within it the seeds of decay, and when at its best it began to fail.

There was a tendency in the middle age of which we are now speaking, which is very interesting to trace in its operations. It was a general tendency pervading every department of social life, and has left its mark deep in modern and especially in English institutions. It is perhaps the most striking social phenomenon of those times. I mean the universal impulse in every force in society to seek after independence of all other forces. No sooner did men come together for a common end than they claimed the right of association without interference. No sooner did an officer exercise an authority however foreign to his office than he assumed a settled and ex-

clusive jurisdiction over the matter. Every industry, trade, and profession was organized in a corporate society, regulated by rules of its own making and consolidated by protecting its members and crushing intermeddlers. You may see particular instances in the corporate privileges of cities, of inns of court, and of colleges and universities, all of which withdrew themselves from the ordinary jurisdictions and set up their own exclusive of all others. You may trace it in the history of the several courts of law, which once united in the *aula regis* became independent tribunals. The monasteries denying the Bishop's jurisdiction and the rector gathering into his hands the tithes of his parish and holding them as an estate on theories drawn from feudal law, are further and familiar examples of the same process.

It was but natural that the Cathedral body under the strong influences of this general tendency should aspire to corporate unity and independence, drawing away from the diocese and its clergy on the one side and

seeking exemption from Episcopal control on the other. Circumstances favored the pretension. Before the eyes of the members of these bodies was the example of the monasteries: they never tolerated on the part of the Bishop any share or oversight of the administration of their affairs. It was only under stress of circumstances that they admitted him within their cloisters, and they dismissed him from their gates as soon as he had discharged his function. Often they sought consecration for their abbots so as not to stand in need of any Episcopal service from one not of their order. With such an example before their eyes, it would be strange indeed if the ambition of the Dean and Chapter were not inflamed by the spectacle.

And the Chapter had become a corporation which could think, feel and aspire for itself. When the Canons dwelt in the houses, were fed at the table, and clothed with the means of the Bishop, and when afterwards Bishops and Canons were supplied from common funds, there was mutual dependence and intimate re-

lations. But we have seen that a time came when the Canons had estates of their own. It is but the part of human nature that with houses and lands, benefices and estates, food, clothes, and money of their own, they should assert their independence of him and seek in every way to strengthen it. At last the Chapters became as jealous of the Episcopal prerogative as the monasteries were.

And on the other side the circumstances were favorable to the growth of the new pretension. The Bishop was one of the great barons of the realm. As Bishop he owed duties to the Church, but as a lord he owed duties to the crown. He sat in parliament and in the councils of the king, and was very often called to the great offices of chancellor, treasurer, secretary, and ambassador to foreign courts and to Rome. It was but natural to give to the more shining office the share of time and service which was fairly due to the sacred function. When he was not occupied by his civil duties, he was beset by temptations of another sort. As one of

the barons of the realm he was possessed of great manors, sumptuous palaces, beautiful gardens, and wide hunting grounds. To these estates he could retire and enjoy the ease, leisure and luxury which contrasted strongly with the severity and contentions of life within the Cathedral close. Ambition on the one hand and love of pleasant ease on the other inclined the Bishops to withdraw to their own palaces, and leave the estates, interests and administration of the Cathedrals in the itching hands of Deans and Chapters.

And so it came about under these influences, active on both sides, and under the pressure of a general political tendency of the times, that the Chapter realized for itself all its ambition, and became a detached, separate and isolated corporation. The departments of administration were divided between the Bishop and his Chapter: he came to manage the affairs of the diocese without reference to the advice of the Chapter: the Chapter came to manage the affairs of the Cathedral with little reference to the author-

ity of the Bishop. From being the head of the Chapter, the Bishop came to have less authority in his own Church than in any other in the diocese: from being the constant advisers of the Bishop in his administration, the Chapter were alienated from the Episcopal function and the administration of the diocese. Thus the whole of that scheme of organization and administration which excited our admiration lapsed into desuetude.

It is necessary at this point to make a general correction, or at least modification, of the above account, without which the history of Cathedrals would involve us in inconsistencies at many points. The clergy of the days of which we have been speaking were divided into two distinct classes. One was those who lived in the world; that is they had their own houses, were not uncommonly married, and were bound by no vows but to obey the laws of the Church. They were called Seculars. The other class was the Monks. They took upon themselves the vows of pov-

erty, chastity, and obedience, and thereby became bound to a rule of life, for which reason they were called Regulars. When the Bishop first went forth to plant his See in his diocese, and selected the clergy who should go with him to be his companions, he adopted one or other of these classes at his pleasure. Accordingly, one Bishop formed his Chapter of Seculars, who were called Canons, while another formed his Chapter of Regulars, and his Cathedral was a monastery. Thus at London, York, Exeter, Salisbury, Wells, Lincoln, Litchfield, Hereford, and Chichester the Chapters were of Seculars; while at Canterbury, Winchester, Worcester, Durham, Norwich, Rochester, Ely, and Carlisle the Cathedrals were monasteries. In the latter the head of the Chapter was an Abbot or Prior instead of a Dean. Except in the respect of discipline, Cathedrals served by monks did not greatly differ from those served by Seculars. In the former the offices of Precentor, Chancellor, and Treasurer did not exist, nor were the stalls endowed

with prebendal estates. If this had been all of the matter we could hardly afford it the small space which we have given it. But there is a great historical event which must be noted in any such sketch as this.

When Henry the Eighth sent forth his injunctions for the suppression of the monasteries, he made no exception of the Cathedrals which were served by monks. There was no reason for excepting them; for having excluded the Bishops they were practically not unlike other monasteries. The monks having been driven out of these Cathedrals, the king was obliged to found new Chapters composed of secular priests. These institutions of Henry were constituted upon the general plan of others of the class. There were the Dean with the usual powers, and the Canons all of whom were to reside in the close for at least six months of the year; their number varying at different Cathedrals from four to twelve. There were no non-resident Canons; but instead there were honorary Canons who had no duties in the Choir or voice in Chapter. There

were no Vicars; but minor Canons discharged the same functions, and the lay members of the choir were called lay clerks. The duties of Precentor were devolved on a minor canon: the offices of Chancellor and Treasurer were abolished. It would be a needless repetition to point out the details of the differences between the Cathedrals founded by Henry in place of the monasteries, and those which we have particularly described. One broad distinction cannot fail to at once arrest attention. The constitution of the new bodies was more simple and their relations to the Bishop and the diocese were less intimate. Constructed when these institutions had detached themselves from the Bishop on the one side and the diocese on the other, it was but natural that they should be erected into a place and a service even more isolated, special and peculiar than ever before. These creations of Henry are called Cathedrals of the new foundation: the others Cathedrals of the old foundation.

Before we stopped to make this correction, we saw that the Canons had become separated

into two classes: there were those who left their prebends to Vicars and resided at the Cathedral most of the time, and there were those who left the Cathedral and resided on their prebendal estates. The cause of the separation was the fact that the Canons had two offices and two sources of income. When the distinction between the residentiaries and non-residentiaries became fixed, the former still retaining their prebends, began to find attractions there, and to withdraw themselves from the duties which formerly they had preferred and to which they were committed. And so it came about that the very Canons who had been specially charged with the services and work of their Cathedrals and were called residentiaries, became, notwithstanding their title, in point of fact non-resident. In order to supply or pretend to supply the defect, so that the Cathedral should not be entirely forsaken the rule was adopted that every Canon should live in the close three months in the year. The terms of residence were arranged by the members of the

Chapter, or were appointed by the Dean. In this way the force of clergy in residence at one time was reduced to the minimum.

There is something almost ludicrous in the insignificance to which the Chapter was reduced. At the Cathedrals of the old foundation the numbers of the Canons varied from eight at some to twelve at others. Even this trifling number was seldom called together; and save at an election to the bishopric of the appointee of the crown, they were all hardly ever at one time within the close. When in the course of the terms appointed for the Canons one alone was in residence, as often happened, he and the Dean could hold a Chapter in the stately Chapter house, where, with the Bishop at their head, the thirty, forty, fifty Canons had of old thronged in affluent state and ceremonious dignity and deliberated upon the interests of the Church.

And yet it is hardly fair to put this forth as a picture of Cathedral life even in those days. There was the goodly numbers of Vicars Choral or Minor Canons with the Choristers, who in

company with the Dean and the one or two Canons in residence maintained morning and even song of exceeding beauty, while upon Sunday the anthem filled choir and nave with the notes of melodious praise. It needs but to remember the familiar verses of the Elegy written in those very days to vindicate the right of the Cathedrals then to be. In keeping alive the true music of the sanctuary, even in their low estate they gave to the Church a sufficient service. The long list of those who have at once filled Cathedral stalls and adorned the annals of literature and scientific theology prove that these institutions have not been altogether unserviceable, even when they have been inactive in the ways in which they once were useful to society and the Church.

We pass over a great period of time during which the constitution of the Chapters underwent few if any changes, and their place in the polity of the Church was not enlarged. In 1840 an act of parliament was passed reorganizing them all on one plan: those of the old foundation and those of the new alike. It is

a very voluminous statute; we need here to notice only a few of its provisions.

(1) The number of the Canons, that is those who had active duties in connection with the Cathedral, was cut down from twelve, the number of residents at some, and from eight at others. At Canterbury, Durham and Ely there were to be six; at Winchester, five; at all the others four. Residence was to be, of the Deans eight months in the year, and of each Canon three months. The Deans were to be appointed by the crown and the Canons by the Bishop.

(2) The endowments of the prebends not residentiary, and also of certain dignitaries, that is the Sub-Dean, Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Treasurer, Provost, Precentor, and Succentor, were suppressed as separate estates; those officers retaining only such stipends or emoluments as were accustomably paid to the holder thereof out of the general revenues of the Cathedral.

(3) In one section it is recited that "whereas, it is expedient that all Bishops should be

empowered to confer distinctions of honor upon deserving clergymen," and it is enacted that "honorary canonries shall be hereby founded in every Cathedral Church in England in which there are not already founded any non-residentiary prebends, dignities or offices, and the holders of such canonries shall be styled Honorary Canons, and shall be entitled to stalls and to take rank in the Cathedral Church next after the Canons, and shall be subject to such regulations respecting the mode of their appointment and otherwise as shall be determined on by the authority hereinafter provided, with the consent of the said Cathedral Churches respectively, and the number of such Honorary Canonries hereby founded in each Cathedral Church shall be twenty-four." This section leaves the Prebendaries or non-resident Canons in the Cathedrals of the old foundation, but without separate estates: the Honorary Canons in those of the new foundation where there now were Prebends serving the same purpose.

(4) The respective Chapters were to appoint

the Minor Canons, of whom in no case were there to be more than six nor less than two. No one of them could hold another benefice more than six miles from his Cathedral, and his income as Minor Canon was not to exceed one hundred and fifty pounds. The term Minor Canon includes "every Vicar, Vicar-Choral, Vicar-Priest and Senior Vicar, being the member of the choir in any Cathedral or Collegiate Church."

(5) Archdeaconries could be endowed by the annexation of an entire canonry, or a portion of the income thereof subject to several limitations.

It is perhaps hardly worth while to review this plan, and remark that the clergy serving a Cathedral are the Dean, who is to reside at his Church only three-fourths of the year, one Canon resident at a time, and two or at the most four Minor Canons or Vicars; or that the Chapter having the actual administration in its hands consists of the Dean and four or six Canons. Certainly a very small force as compared to the number of Cathedral clergy when those institutions were at the height of their usefulness

and development. In the Cathedrals of the old foundations the Canons non-residentiary take their turns in preaching in the Cathedral, for which they receive a small compensation. They have no other duties except when summoned to the greater Chapters.

The reduction of the number of canonries was felt to be wrong in principle and evil in effect. To remedy the mischief, in 1874 an act was passed for the establishment of additional canonries, and the conversion of a non-residentiary prebend into a canonry and "for accepting and assigning for the endowment of the same any endowment in money or land given by a private person or persons." Under this gracious permission a way is open for the piety of this generation to restore to the Cathedrals such numbers of Clergy as may be needed for the work which the Chapter may propose to itself. Nor is it altogether a vain hope that the day may come when these venerable Churches will enjoy their pristine glory.

The act passed in 1875 providing for the

erection of the Bishopric of St. Albans contained no express or particular provision for a Cathedral or a Chapter, but they are referred to as in contemplation, and Honorary Canons were provided for. The act of 1876 providing for Truro empowered the queen in council to assign to the new "Bishopric as a Cathedral Church the Parish Church in Truro subject to the rights of the patron and incumbent of such Church." And as in the act of the preceding year, the Cathedral and Chapter are anticipated, and provision is made for the usual number of Honorary Canons. In the act of 1878 authorizing the erection of the Bishoprics of Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell, and Wakefield, like provision is made for the use of Parish Churches as Cathedrals and for Honorary Canons. In the same year an act was passed "to make provision for the foundation of a Dean and Chapter for the Bishopric of Truro," etc. By itself it is not very instructive. It provides that, with funds yielding £1,000 per annum for the Dean and £300 for each of four resident Canons, the

queen may, by order in council, erect the corporation: meanwhile, whenever funds yielding £300 are duly vested for a residentiary canonry, it may be erected. The statutes are to be made by the queen in council. The crown is to have the patronage of the Deanery, and the Bishop of the Canonries.

With these insufficient statutory powers, but with a wisdom and vigor all his own, the Bishop, now elevated to the primacy, organized his Chapter. In an address delivered by him in 1877, he prophesies that at some day "some grand munificence shall arise, or self-denial shall combine, to found in the beauty of holy order the great cathedral offices," until which time there will not fail among churchmen the devotion to discharge the duties apart from the emoluments. He thinks the decanal stall may bide its time until the men and funds to be governed demand a governor. An Honorary Chancellor has been secured for the instruction of divinity students. The most interesting of the institutions founded in connection with this

new cathedral is an association of Missioners. In Truro Diocesan Kalendar for 1881 is this passage:

"Cathedral Missioners. *Sanctificatio in veritate.* The object of this association is to provide a staff of preachers, who, not being bound by parochial or other ties, may be entirely at the disposal of the Bishop for any work to which he may see fit to send them, at the call of the parochial clergy. Besides undertaking and arranging for missions (technically so called), where the Bishop and parochial clergy think desirable, they will endeavor, as far as their numbers may permit, to give courses of sermons or lectures, at populous centers, to supply spiritual ministrations during the absence or sickness of incumbents, and to help in the gathering of candidates for confirmation, in the formation of branches of the church society for the advancement of holy living, or other societies approved by the Bishop, in the instruction or supervision of lay preachers, in the promotion of mission chapels, and in other works which aim at

the spiritual and moral improvement of the people. There is as yet no endowment of any kind; and, in view of increasing work and numbers, it is felt necessary henceforth to ask that the travelling expenses of a Missioner's visit may be defrayed. This may be done either by collections at the time, or by devoting yearly offertories or subscriptions to the maintenance of the association. The staff at present consists of the following members: Arthur James Mason, M.A., Fellow and Late Assist. Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge, Canon of Truro, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop.—Francis Edward Carter, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, Prebendary of Endellion. Missions have been held since last October at St. Dominick, South Hill and Callington, Constantine, and Mawgan-in-Pyder."

In the address above referred to the Bishop says: "It is no true reverence to follow up old lines without extending them. They give dignity if we know how to develop them; but if we will not step beyond them on vital

call, we make trammels for ourselves, and are most unlike those old founders whom we propose to imitate. Travels and observations up and down this country, inquiry, reading, conversation, and reflection, have convinced me that the work antiently expected of the old prebendaries, who preached up and down the diocese, seconding, aiding, enforcing the work of the parish priest at his own request, is no less required than ever. The tired and weary and often lonely clergymen asks it; the people ask it; their condition asks it. I should be no true shepherd here did I veil the truth from such an assemblage as this. And sure I am that the chaotic religious beliefs, and the inexplicable severance and gulf which in some places exists between moral practice and fervent religionism, do absolutely need this identical work to be done. One Missioner attached to the Cathedral will be *unus pro multis*, will stand single-handed to represent the many mission preachers of the old idea. But I believe he will not want for helpers. I believe that the mission chapels, fast multi-

plying, with their lay readers, who will need some help, some cautions, some training, will be deemed by us all to offer great scope for such work—to say nothing of parochial missions, which have so happily affected the well-being of many Parishes. And I am sure that neither he nor any other man, who puts his shoulder to the wheel to place a Cathedral body in a position to do the special works which must go undone unless there is such a body to do them (even though it takes years to develop it and though beginnings are to some men tedious), will ever want your good wishes, your liberality, and your availing prayers."

In very few of the Irish Cathedrals are there resident Canons or Precentors, Chancellors or Treasurers. The non-residentiaries have only a titular office. The Dean is save in name only the Rector of the Parish; he has cure of souls; he is assisted by one or two, in a very few instances by more Priest Vicars. The Cathedral is in fact a parish Church.

We pass now from the Mother Church of

England to her daughters in the colonies and in our own country. Departing from the course of things in the regions which were sanctified by the footprints of the Apostles, the Anglican Church when planted beyond her island home was organized without the Cathedral. In Canada the royal patents by which the Bishops were appointed seem to have made no reference to their Cathedrals. But that by which Dr. Fulford was appointed Bishop of Montreal ordained and declared "that the parish church called Christ Church in the said city of Montreal should thenceforth be the Cathedral Church and the See of the said Bishop of Montreal, and his successors in the said See." And it is reasonable to suppose, in the absence of accurate information, that the like course was followed in the case of other Bishops. From all which it may be stated, that after a considerable growth of the Church the course in the Provinces was to superimpose the Cathedral upon a parish Church. All that was actually accomplished was the erecting in its

proper place in the Church of the Bishop's throne with the right vested in him of occupying it.

How far the crown was competent to intrude into parish Churches even for this purpose, would be an interesting question, if it were ever raised. But this being conceded, as it has been, there remains unoccupied the wide field of the relations of the Bishop on one side, and the rector and parish on another side, and of the diocese, its synod and administrative boards on the third side. These relations have in some cases, perhaps in most cases, been fixed in writings called "statutes of agreement" between the Bishop of the one part, the rector of the second part, and the rector and churchwardens of the third part, all acting in their respective corporate capacities, for themselves and their successors. Shortly stated, the stipulations of these agreements are,

1. As to the Rector, that he shall be responsible for the due and orderly performance of divine service, subject only to such general

directions in that behalf as the Bishop may issue to the diocese, and for the execution of all duties pertaining thereto, either as a Cathedral or as a parochial church, subject to the Bishop's control only as a Rector in England is subject to his Bishop. The fabric of the church is under the control of the Rector and Wardens according to the laws in force in Canada.

2. As to the Bishop, that he may at all times take such part in the services and preach at such times as he may desire, notice of from four days to one week being given to the Rector of his intention to preach on any particular occasion. At visitations, confirmations, ordinations, meetings of diocesan and provincial synods and on occasions of public thanksgivings and fasts he has charge of the services; appointing the preachers, assigning seats to the clergy, subject to the rights of the Canons and Archdeacons to their stalls in the upper tier of the choir. He may invite strangers to preach or officiate with the concurrence of the Rector and upon due notice. He is to have

the use of the rooms in the Cathedral for such meetings as he may desire to hold.

3. All orders and directions concerning the Church, either as a parochial Church or as a Cathedral are to be given to the subordinate officers through the Rector or in his absence through the Wardens.

4. Assistant Ministers are to be nominated to the Bishop by the Rector, but shall not officiate until they have received the license of the Bishop, as is customary in the Church of England generally. The Rector of the Parish is the Dean of the Cathedral and as such he is installed and he bears that title.

It will be observed that no provision is made for Canons or a Chapter. The Bishops have generally appointed Canons from the Priests of the Diocese having cures or engaged in education. They have stalls in the Cathedral but no other connection with it. In some Cathedrals certain parochial clergy are Canons, *ex officiis*, who hold a position much like that of Honorary Canons in England. In a few Dioceses they are organized into a Chap-

ter, but no active or practical duties are devolved on the body.

At Toronto a long step has been taken in advance by a Bishop whose unaffected earnestness and practical wisdom remind us of the first Bishop of Truro. In his address to his synod in 1881, Bishop Sweatman entered somewhat largely into an apology for Cathedrals in the colonies. Remitting the public and musical services of the Church to a secondary but by no means unimportant place, he pictures to us the Cathedral duly "constituted and officered as the center of union to the whole diocese; the center of education, learning, and pulpit power; the center of spiritual life and Christian charities; the center from which radiates missionary effort." And then he sets forth the practical workings of the system, in a passage so simple, direct, satisfying, and convincing, that we cannot forbear to quote it at length. "But I have hardly yet justified my grounds in expressing so sanguine an expectation as to the great advantages that would attend such an establishment. Let me

illustrate them more distinctly. Supposing that I had resident in Toronto, say four Canons, men of thorough practical parochial experience, of true missionary spirit, of a high order of pulpit power, of intense sympathy, and above all full of earnest spiritual life (for they would need to be all this); the value of such a body of men would be incalculable, as councillors and advisors. But,—here is the point I wish to bring out—a mission in the diocese is, for some cause, evidently in an unprosperous condition; the clergyman complains that he can not obtain support from the people; or the Church is losing ground, and so forth. I direct one of my Canons to go to this place, to enquire into what is wrong, to stay a week, two weeks, or three weeks, to rouse up the people, and put new life into the Church's work. A young and inexperienced clergyman meets with difficulties he does not know how to deal with; he needs advice and guidance; another of the Chapter is sent to help him, to put him in the way of doing his work better; with the loving words and ma-

ture wisdom of an older brother to give him confidence and cheer. Or a clergyman writes me for help in an emergency; his parish is invaded by a new sect, preaching strange doctrines and drawing his people away from the faith; he had spent himself in labors to counteract the mischief, but finds that it is an unequal task to cope with single-handed, or his arguments are exhausted, and he wants another mind to reinforce him with fresh arguments. Here is help for the emergency—a well learned, and well equipped, and zealous member of the Cathedral Staff ready to go to the rescue.

"Have I justified my assertion? I feel sure that every earnest and faithful parish clergyman will confess that such a system, by which the clergy might occasionally be stirred up to more diligence, cheered in their isolation, aided in their difficulties, by a visit from a brother such as I have described, would go a long way to break down the congregationalism, to awaken the spiritual torpor of the people, to arouse to activity the missionary

indifference, to systematize the ineffective diffusion of forces,—the chief difficulties and evils under which we suffer. To carry out this system fully will require means and time; but a small beginning may be made. I shall not touch the question of means: but I cannot forbear a concluding remark, that it is tantalizing to be taunted with aping titles and dignities, and at the same time to feel that no colonial diocese ever had so nearly within its grasp the power to erect and maintain a real living Cathedral establishment, with its active Chapter and staff of officers, as the Diocese of Toronto with its richly endowed Church in the capital."

In January of this year the Provincial Legislature passed "An Act to incorporate the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral of St. Alban the Martyr, Toronto," the first section of which was as follows:

"There shall be and there is hereby constituted and established in the city of Toronto, in the province of Ontario, a body politic and corporate, in connection with the

Church of England in Canada, under the name of 'the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral of St. Alban the Martyr,' which corporation shall consist of the Right Reverend the Bishop of Toronto for the time being in connection with the said church, who shall be the Dean of the Chapter hereby incorporated, and the Archdeacons and Canons of the diocese of Toronto for the time being, and eight lay members, four to be elected by the individual clerical members of the said synod of the diocese of Toronto, and four to be elected by the individual lay members of the said synod in synod assembled, and such lay members, when so elected, shall hold office during life or until resignation or removal of residence from the diocese of Toronto; the said Bishop, Archdeacons, Canons, and lay members of the said Chapter shall be the governing body of the said corporation, except only that the powers of the lay members of the said Chapter shall be limited to the management of the temporalities of the said corporation."

Churchmen in the United States will look

with interest to what may be done under this act towards the solution of the questions presented by the subject of Cathedral organization.

In our country everything that has been done in the way of organizing the institution of the Cathedral has been tentative. All who have taken a hand in the work have been careful to say so. They have been conscious that the conditions of the problem are novel, and that institutions of another age or another country may not be suited to our needs. To draw off on paper a scheme of organization after the pattern of the Chapters of the fourteenth century is easy enough: almost any mere copyist could do it. The amplitude of the machinery, its complex details, the variety of the uses it could serve, the charm of the venerable past, render the system very attractive. But all quite understand that to realize it is on many accounts impossible. Even if it were practicable to set such a scheme going here, it would not be long before changes would take place so

many and so great, that it would not be recognized in the institution which would grow out of it. Accordingly every plan that has been proposed has been set forth simply as convenient under the circumstances, to be tried for a time and changed as experience shall suggest. This doing presently what seems to answer for the present and waiting on the future for what shall prove to be best, gives to the history of these attempts their interest.

And, besides, these tentative schemes are being planned and tried in many different places without concert and without much mutual or consistent action. This is necessarily so, because each diocese acts by itself, and under the influences of the opinions of its own Bishop and its own circumstances. For all the Bishops to draw up one plan of Cathedral organization to be put in operation everywhere, even if they could harmonize their views, would be impracticable, because of the various and diverse circumstances of their dioceses. What would be apt to the

conditions of one would be unsuited to those of another. But whether such action be practicable or not, it is not the way in which the problem is being worked out. Accordingly many plans differing more or less in principle and differing largely in details are now undergoing trial and working towards a degree of completeness. It is not to be expected that in the end one common system will be developed, any more than it is practicable to adopt one at the outset. We are to expect that the Cathedrals of the future will be unlike in many things and will do their work in many modes. As each works its way towards what it shall be, one cannot help tracing its course with an interested curiosity and gathering much that will assist those who may direct any other development.

In the progress heretofore made in the history of Cathedral organization in the American Church, three periods may be pretty clearly distinguished. The Cathedrals first planted here were much like the Canadian and the recent English institutions. They

were parish churches with the Bishop's chair set up in the chancel or choir. This was all. The Cathedral was superimposed upon the parish. The corporation remained as before "the Rector, Wardens, and Vestrymen of" the Church. It retained the legal title and exclusive administration of the property; and whatever agreements it may have made, granting rights to the Episcopate, it could determine them at its pleasure. Usually the Bishop was promised a right to occupy his seat, to preach, to direct the ritual, and to use the building when and as he saw fit; but as the promise was in law beyond the corporate competency of the vestry the right was held upon sufferance. There was a certain moral guarantee of permanence. The precedence of the Church as the Cathedral and the frequent attendance of the Bishop at its services, and the use of the building on interesting occasions, on the one hand, and the force of an agreement once made, a withdrawal from which raises a suspicion of delinquency, on the other, give a pretty strong

support to the arrangement. Still it is felt that there is an infirmity in it. At the same time the arrangement has good precedent. We have seen that it is what obtains in Canada, and in several of the newly elected dioceses of England. We who are but a handful can hardly presume to despise what the English Parliament has thought adequate for the first years of St. Albans, Truro, and Liverpool, although neither there nor here has all been done that is desired. Examples of the Cathedrals of the class above described are St. Paul's, Buffalo, and St. Paul's, Indianapolis.

To the same period are to be assigned the cathedrals, examples of which are Sts. Peter and Paul, Chicago, and Our Merciful Saviour, Faribault. They are independent of the parish, the property in respect both of its title and its administration being in the Bishop. This independence is accounted by many an important advance upon the arrangement above described. And no doubt it is so far as certainty and permanency go. But we place all of these institutions in the same

category notwithstanding this point of dissimilarity, because of their radical consistency. They are all recognized in the constitution or canons of the diocese as Cathedrals, and the officers of some have rights *ex officiis;* such as seats in the annual council. But beyond this these Churches have little to distinguish them from parish Churches. They have no Chapter or function not local to the building. The diocese as a body has no actual organic relations with them. What they are, what is special, particular, and distinguishable in them may be easily seen from the advocacy by aid of which they have been established. It was that the Bishop ought to have his own Church, in which he should stand forth as the High Priest, and as vested with the primary function of the Episcopate. As administrative agencies of the diocese, as containing, reflecting, representing or serving it as an organic body, their claims were not urged. They were to contribute to the splendor and efficiency of the Episcopate, but did not aspire to be the focus and point of union

of the diocese. They are episcopal and not diocesan institutions.

It is right to speak particularly of Faribault because so much has been done there close by the Cathedral and by the Bishop himself, that it is an apt illustration of the character of the class of which we are speaking. That the purely Episcopal character of the institution may be clearly apprehended, we quote a description of it which Bishop Whipple gave the writer in a letter written for the purpose. He says the Cathedral "should be solely in the Bishop's care, that he may set forth such a ritual as may be a model for the diocese; it needs only such machinery as will help him." . . . . . "In my absence the assistant pastor of the Cathedral congregation is virtually the Dean and has entire control. The church and congregation support him. It has no machinery whose friction may fetter me. It gives me all I ask and I work on as I can. God has blessed us, and so I like the plan."

Having justified by these words the propriety

of characterizing Our Merciful Saviour, of Faribault, as an Episcopal as distinguishable from a diocesan institution, we proceed to the point to which we wish to call attention. Besides building his Cathedral, Bishop Whipple has established at this place his Divinity, Boys', and Girls' Schools. The ample and beautiful structures in which the two first are housed and which is now building for the third, the abundant equipment in all the appliances of education, and the high standard of instruction of these institutions, put each of them at the very head of the schools of the Church. Taken all together they are a galaxy with which no other diocese in this country has anything comparable.

Now it is natural to say that the Cathedral with these schools about it realizes in a very high degree the true character of such institutions. But that is the very point; each one of these schools is disconnected from the Cathedral: it is organically a separate, independent, individual establishment. It has a board of trust and government of its own: it follows its

own way by itself: it serves its own ends alone. There is a single point of contact in the Bishop who is the head of each, but otherwise each is isolated from the others. And with the Cathedral neither has any organic connection. The pupils of all attend certain of the services, although each school has its own very beautiful chapel; but none of all their teachers has by virtue of his office and of right any place or function or service there. In the midst of these splendid establishments, the Cathedral stands the grand church of the Bishop, by his will and under his discipline gathering under its ample roof all of these scholars because they are his children. So that it will be seen how these Cathedrals even in the midst of many other Church institutions are strictly personal and only Episcopal.

The second period in the course of the development of the Cathedral was when Chapters were organized. The Episcopate remains in the institutions of this class, the primary, active, and central function, but it is no longer the sole, only and unqualified authority. The

Bishop holds his office apart, sharing it with none, but within the precincts of the Cathedral exercising it by the aid of his presbytery. All Saints, Albany, New York, and Grace, Davenport, Iowa, are examples of this class. Bishop Doane set forth a clear exposition of the principles on which his Cathedral was organized in his address to the convention of 1875. He says: "In January last, the general Chapter, provided for by the constitution, was called together. It is intended to be, and is, a thorough and widely distributed representation of the whole diocese; consisting as it does of persons chosen by the convocations, as in the case of Archdeacons; and by the convention, as in the case of the Members of the Standing Committee, of the Board of Missions, of the Deputation of the General Convention, and the Secretary and Treasurer of the diocese; and besides these, of the Rectors of the two older churches in Albany. This is the electoral body, choosing, on the Bishop's nomination, the clerical, and on their own motion, the lay members of the Cathedral

Chapter; and its approval is necessary to any alteration of the Cathedral constitution. It is virtually the convention of the diocese out of session; because it consists of those whom the convention honors with its confidence, by placing them in its most important positions of trust. And while it is large enough, consisting of forty-eight members, and varied enough, fifteen of its members being laymen; it is yet small enough, to secure the possibility of its assemblage. This body assembled in Troy, a year ago, and acting under the constitution, elected the four principal persons, two Canons and six laymen, as members of the Chapter." . . . . . "Representatively speaking, in its governing body, it is the diocese 'in petto;' and representatively speaking, in its congregation, it is the place of worship for all churchmen of the diocese when they are here, and for all churchmen here, who belong to no parish." . . . . . "But the strong point of the case is the close connection between the fact of a Bishop, and the fact of a Cathedral, which belong really to each other; not in sentiment

or imagination, not as foisting old fashioned notions upon modern times; but as illustrating an inherent principle of the Episcopate. The Cathedral Church will be the place for the gatherings of the clergy, with the Bishop; the building, for the solemn official acts of the Bishop, in ordinations and the gathering of synods; the Church that shall be the bond of unity, and the point of meeting, among clergymen otherwise narrowed and separated into personal interests alone; the Church, whose frequent services and celebrations of the Holy Communion shall make somewhat real, what no Bishop can be willing to allow to be forgotten, the permanent, or at least life-long, pastoral relation that exists between himself, as the chief earthly pastor, and the pastors and people of his diocese. It will be the central point, to which the hearts of all the diocese may turn, as the place where 'prayer is wont to be made,' and in which, whether present or absent, they are daily remembered before the throne of grace." . . . . . "It will be the nucleus, about which, as strength and ability

increase, may gather godly and learned men able to care for the training and examination of the candidates for holy orders, and to prepare themselves to meet, by constant study, the incessant shiftings of that old opposition to the truth, which by frequent and rapid changes of side, seems all the while to be something new. It will be the religious and spiritual source and home, for the training and refreshing of those who may desire, as lay men or as women, to devote themselves to the closer service of God. It will be the house of worship and religious instruction, for the children who may be gathered from the distant parts of the diocese or country, to go back, carrying with them what they have gained here, for the enlivening and enriching of their homes. It will be the root from which, in time, will grow up the houses of mercy, of shelter, of education, which find their natural origin in the Episcopate."

In these pregnant sentences and in others following, for which we have not room, we have presented to our vision a grand conception of a very grand establishment. All

who for a moment incline to join in condemning or ridiculing the Cathedral as a pretty theory, a plaything, a fossil and relic of a dismal past, ought to read and try fairly to realize the scheme of Bishop Doane. With a full appreciation of its splendor, we must remark upon its organic constitution. This is to be said in the first place in its behalf as regards the special point we purpose to make: it is recognized in the constitution and provided for in the Canons of the Diocese; its primary authority called the Greater Chapter is almost entirely composed of diocesan officers; its place and work and service is above and outside those of a parish among parishes; they are essentially diocesan. There may be lacking in the choicest and strongest of the Bishop's words the distinctness of Archbishop Benson about the need and use of a band of missioners, or as we say missionaries, and of Bishop Sweatman about the assistance the Cathedral clergy may give to their parochial brethern, but all those agencies may fairly be brought within the circumscription of the

Albany scheme. So that the diocesan character, relations and functions of the Chapter are well conceived there. But looking to the organism, it is plain to see that it is an independent, detached, isolated, local body. There is a shadow of something broader in the construction of the General Chapter; but it is without reality. While the *personnel* of the General Chapter is diocesan its functions are too limited to communicate that character to the Cathedral. It is simply an electoral body; it has no active or administrative or visitorial power. It convenes only to elect Members of the lesser Chapter and to attend the Bishop on special occasions. No organic connection of practical efficiency between the Cathedral and the diocese can be traced through the General Chapter. The Chapter proper, is composed of the Bishop, Dean, Precentor, Chancellor, Treasurer, four minor Canons, and six laymen, none of whom except the Bishop has any other diocesan relations or duties or rights than any clergyman or layman has. The body is not charged with the care of the missions of the

diocese, and whatever it attempts in that service must be in subordination to the Board of Missions. It has not the administration of the funds or property of the diocese, but they remain in the hands of special committees. The schools and hospitals organically are as independent at Albany as at Faribault. And lastly, there is no duty on the Bishop's part to ask the Chapter for advice, nor on its part to give him the same when asked for it: in no sense is it the Senate of the diocese. That it is a local institution appears from a section of the constitution, to which, rather than the exposition from which we have quoted, we should look for a definition of its work. Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution is as follows:

"The Chapter is charged, under the direction of the Bishop, to advance the missionary work of the Church in and about the city of Albany, to maintain a constant and well ordered worship of Almighty God, to found and uphold Christian schools, and to begin and sustain every practicable work of Christian charity."

We are therefore bound to say that the Albany Cathedral in its structure and essential organism is as independent as a parish, in respect of diocesan administration and is local to the see city in respect of diocesan service. Of its moral influence upon the diocese and of the diocese upon it, and of the good it does to all people in the diocese by what it is, and what it does in the see city, we are not now speaking.

When Bishop Perry went to Iowa he found himself in the midst of many happy circumstances for organizing his Cathedral. His predecessor had acquired a large and beautiful estate in the city of Davenport, upon which he had erected buildings for a college and a divinity school. Funds for the endowment of these institutions had been gathered, and a very competent and ample Episcopal residence had been erected. But the work of Bishop Lee's life with which we have to do was the building of the Cathedral. This was a beautiful and imposing structure upon the same grounds. By the express conditions of

the benefactions with which it was built it was devoted to diocesan, in distinction from parochial purposes and control. By the express request of the diocesan convention it had been consecrated as a Cathedral. In a document of the most formal and solemn nature Bishop Lee had declared it consecrated as Grace Cathedral. In many public acts he impressed it with a diocesan character, and when his work on earth was ended he passed it on to him who should come after him, charged with that sacred and special trust. Nor was this all. There were in Davenport two parishes with all the rights of preoccupancy. The property of one was extensive and eligible: its Church was a large, massive and well appointed structure erected by a devoted wife in memory of its first warden. Bishop Lee in one of his addresses to his convention had spoken with much fullness and anxious hope of the Cathedral then building, and its uses when finished, and then proceeded to say that his desire was that the two parishes of the city should form "one united par-

ish under some acceptable arrangement as a diocesan or Cathedral church;" adding, "the church must be a diocesan or Bishop's church by the conditions of the donations." It was with such a legacy, sanctified by the words and wishes of his venerable and revered predecessor, that Bishop Perry entered upon his work. By judicious measures he soon obtained the free consent of the members and authorities of the two parishes to a union with and in subordination to the Cathedral. The way being thus cleared, he laid out the plan of the Cathedral, its Chapter and work as follows:

Retaining in his own hands the title to the property as security for the performance of the trust upon which he holds it, he has erected a Chapter, at the head of which is the Dean, with the usual powers of such officer. The present Dean is the head of the college and of the theological school. There is a senior Canon, to whom is committed the pastoral care of the congregation. There are also the Canons, whose special duties are at the churches heretofore parish

churches, and in the schools. "Curators of the Cathedral" are laymen charged with the temporalities, who collect and disburse the income, applying it to pay the stipend of the senior Canon, the maintenance of the fabric and of the services as ordered by the Dean and Canon, and the diocesan charges and assessments. These form the Chapter. Its work is, first, to maintain the worship in the Cathedral in rich, abundant and appropriate services; secondly, to conduct the work of the parish churches and missions in the see city; thirdly, to carry on the several schools; fourthly, to extend missionary efforts into the diocese as fully and as far as is possible. Everything that can be said in behalf of the scheme of the Cathedral at Albany is true of that at Davenport. The details of the scheme are not so fully set down in a written constitution and statutes; more is left to circumstances as they may arise; but even in the particulars of the plan the expectation is the same. In one respect the Davenport Cathedral has the advantage

of her sister of Albany, that in her is centered the whole work of the Church in the see city.

But what we have said of the Albany scheme in respect of the relations of the Cathedral and the diocese, is also true of the Davenport scheme. In Iowa the diocesan administration is distributed among several boards, or committees, as the Board of Missions, the Trustees of the Funds of the Diocese, and the Trustees of the Episcopate Funds. It is not proposed to bring their duties and powers within the jurisdiction of the Chapter. The Chapter has no place whatever in the administration of the diocese. Its diocesan character consists only in its services, which it yields through its example, its schools, and its accidental and limited missionary efforts. All this cannot be over estimated; but the fact remains, that the Cathedral system of Iowa does not embody the diocesan system.

A third step in the progress of the Cathedral system in the American Church was

taken when it was organized in Nebraska. When Bishop Clarkson came out to his jurisdiction, the circumstances were untoward, as regards the planting of a Cathedral. At Omaha, the capital of the territory, there was a parish which, for the size of the town, was large, influential and flourishing, and it had a property comparatively speaking of value. It answered fully the needs of the community. To have organized a Cathedral would have dissipated energies already sufficiently taxed; nor were the means at hand for the purpose. Bishop Clarkson had no choice but to adopt Trinity Church as his Cathedral.

All that was attempted or proposed when he first fixed his see in Trinity Church was what we have described above, as the initial period and plan of Cathedral organization. There was the Bishop's chair in the choir, but there was no Chapter. By agreement between him and the vestry, he had the right to preach, and use the church at his pleasure, regulate its ritual, and in case of vacancy in the Rectorship, to nominate five

Presbyters, one of whom the vestry should elect to fill the place. The arrangement was that of the first period which we have described, namely, of the Cathedral superimposed upon the parish with all the limitations which the term implies.

In 1872 the annual council of the diocese passed a canon, organizing a Chapter. The scheme therein laid out has been in force ever since, its principle remaining unchanged, although the details have been somewhat developed. So far as the local institution and its work are involved, the plan is much the same as that at Albany and Davenport. But this system goes farther. The Cathedral Chapter is made up of the Bishop, the Dean, three resident Canons, two of whom are the heads of the diocesan schools, six honorary Canons and four lay delegates, elected upon the Bishop's nomination by the council, two delegates from the vestry of the Cathedral parish, and the officers of the diocese; namely, the Standing Committee, the Chancellor, Secretary, Registrar and Treas-

urer, and a Treasurer of the Chapter. More than two-thirds of the body are selected by the diocesan council.

But the character of the Chapter is to be sought rather in its functions than its *personnel.* It discharges the duties which in many dioceses are committed to a board of missions, to trustees of all of the funds and property of the Church and of the schools, and to all other boards and committees. To it has been conveyed in trust the property of several parishes and missionary stations, including parsonages as well as Churches. Its honorary Canons are rural Deans, and Presidents of the convocations. Its regular meetings are quarterly, and at them full reports from its several Committees, Officers and Canons are made and discussed and measures are framed. The Chapter is in the most actual and practical way the administrative organ of the diocese. The Cathedral of Nebraska is the diocesan system, only partially qualified by the parish.

This plan has been adopted in several

other dioceses and missionary jurisdictions, its details being in some cases modified. As established at Denver it has an ideal perfection; the defects in the system at Omaha having been wholly remedied. Bishop Spaulding had a parcel of land which his predecessor had bought at an early day. It was eligibly located, and of ample size. The parish of St. John in the Wilderness owned lots in the very midst of the city on which was the first Church, of capacity and character unequal to the needs of the city. The Bishop and the vestry agreed upon a plan for the erection upon the property of the former of a Cathedral. He conveyed it by a very carefully drawn instrument upon trusts therein expressed, securing his rights as Bishop and head of the Chapter, and the proper uses and administration of the estates for a Cathedral forever. The result is a building with seats for eighteen hundred persons, an institution with jurisdiction of all work in the city and territory, and a service not surpassed for power, beauty, and variety by that

of any Church in this country. The congregation elects at Easter a certain number of laymen, who are called lay Canons, and are members of the Chapter and have charge of the temporalities of the Cathedral. In plan of organization it is the ideal Cathedral. The days it has already numbered are few. If any device of man can be sure to realize its purposes, the years to come will see Denver demonstrate the full value of the Cathedral system.

We readily anticipate an objection which may naturally be made to what has been said of the diocesan feature of this system. That objection is, that it is practically quite the same thing whether the administration of the diocese be entrusted to several bodies, as Boards and Committees, or to one body, as the Chapter, so long as the members of all of them are elected by and are responsible to the council; in either case the government is diocesan. But the objection misses the point. Our contention is not for the diocesan system; in the American Church that is not

matter of debate; it is settled by the constitution of the General Convention. You have the diocesan system. You may have it in an administration distributed among several distinct bodies; or you may have it in an administration by one body holding and exercising the whole quantum of delegated authority. But if you are to have the Chapter, by it the diocese should be administered. The diocesan system is properly expressed in the Cathedral system. That is the theory of the Nebraska scheme.

We have to-day in the American Church Cathedrals constructed on three plans. The first, are those based on the Episcopal office. The second are those based on the See principle and have Chapters. And the third, are those which embody the diocesan system, having Chapters which are concerned at once with local interests, and are charged with the duty of assisting the Bishop in general administration.

It is interesting to observe that these three classes have succeeded each other in the course

of the development of the Cathedral idea in the American Church, in the order above mentioned and according to the degree of their complexity. First there was simply the Church with the Bishop's chair; then came the Cathedral for the see city; and lastly we have the Chapter aiding the Bishop in administering the diocese. The view which we have given of them has therefore been a narrative of events in their chronological order.

III.

DIFFERENCES.

IT is a long way we have come: even from the days when "Elders were appointed in every city" to these common days of ours. In our hurry we have noted only a very few of the points along the road and given even them only a hasty glance. But we have gathered up some interesting facts. One is, that until the children of the Church of England went forth to the colonies the institution of which we have been speaking was always and everywhere in the Catholic Church; wherever there was a Bishop there was a Cathedral. A strong argument in its behalf may be drawn from this fact. The simple circumstance that any institution or custom or mode of social life exists leads us to suppose that there is some reason for it, and

when we find it in many countries, and in different ages, and under various circumstances we feel very sure that its right to be has a good, deep and natural cause. No argument in behalf of the divine origin and right of Episcopacy carries to the average mind such certain conviction, as the fact that history bears most certain testimony to its existence in the first days and thence to the present in all parts of the world, and that the succession of Bishops may be authentically traced in an unbroken line from the Apostles. Why should not the contention in behalf of the Cathedral drawn from universal prevalence carry the same force with it? We read the history of the Church and find it everywhere and in all ages. Why should we not assume that there are the best, deepest, most natural causes for its existence?

Besides this is another interesting fact, that during the successive periods of its history Cathedrals have in all parts of the Church at the same time undergone much

the same changes. In Asia, Africa, and Southern Europe, in all which regions there was a common civilization, and in Britain where society was rude, primitive and rural during the first centuries, the Cathedral was the focus of the purely diocesan system. Then a change was everywhere wrought by processes somewhat unlike, but coming to the same end, that namely, of establishing the parochial system and thereby modifying the place and work of the Cathedral. Afterwards the institution took on a complex and highly organized form, and at last it began to fall away from its primary rank, use, service, and value. All these changes took place in all countries at times and in ways so nearly the same that one narrative of them will measurably answer for all branches of the Catholic Church.

This coincidence is not only curious: underneath it is a great truth. In the civil history of the Christian era we are astute to trace a development of social and political ideas and institutions on the same lines, in much

the same periods of time, among all nations of the European civilization; and we refer the phenomena to great and efficient forces of general operation. And, on the same principle, we are justified in assuming that the Cathedrals of different peoples also have a common history, because of extensive, radical, and vigorous influences, and that they are great social institutions.

There is another fact more nearly related to our present purpose. While Cathedrals have undergone much the same changes and had the same general structure in all countries, when we go to particulars we see many differences. It is of practical importance to notice this carefully. If it were essential to the integrity of these institutions that they have one form, structure, constitution, and service, they could not have changed from age to age. What they were under the primitive and purely diocesan system they would be to-day. They could not have accommodated themselves to changing circumstances. Let us note briefly some of these differences.

We recall the fact that in a Cathedral of the middle age, served by secular Canons, there were a Precentor, Chancellor, Treasurer, and Prebends; and that in Cathedrals served by Regulars and in the Chapters founded by Henry there were no such dignitaries. Until recently Llandaff had no Dean or resident Canons, the Precentor being the head of the Chapter and the Cathedral being served by minor Canons. At St. Asalps there were no dignitaries but the Dean, and no resident Canons, the Cathedral being served by Vicars Choral. Many of the Irish Cathedrals have no resident Canons and are simply Parish Churches, the Dean being the Rector, with cure of souls and with a certain congregation. We have stated the facts about Truro, but the situation there is temporary. Notwithstanding the loss of its first Bishop it is safe to expect that his plans will be carried out vigorously, and that its Cathedral will become one of the most efficient as well as highly organized in England.

After what we have said a few pages back

of the organizations in Canada and our country, the points in which they agree and the points in which they do not agree with the English model need not be restated. The whole system in the American Church is yet in a formative state.

Other differences are to be noted arising out of difference in situation and consequently in the use of English Cathedrals. Some are in small towns, others in great cities. Ely has only five or six thousand people while her Cathedral is one of the largest, most beautiful and efficiently served of any in the kingdom. What contrasts do Manchester and Liverpool present. In the former a collegiate and in the latter a parish Church has been utilized as a Cathedral. The duties which must primarily engage the attention and labors of the clergy at the country village and in the crowded metropolis must in the nature of things be very unlike. The calm and sequestered Ely is a place for worship, study and contemplation. The thronged streets and wretched alleys of Manchester and Liverpool call loudly

for the activities of charity. Coming to our country, Ely is repeated in Garden City and Manchester in Chicago. When the Cathedral of Long Island shall come into the enjoyment of the splendid endowments which have been promised, it will find its chief work in schools and in worship. And when the day comes, as it surely will, when a like munificence shall illustrate the Cathedral of Illinois its active service will be among and for the millions. These differences in the situation and the appropriate service of Cathedrals have induced the most diverse views of their proper function. The Bishop of Carlisle, long Dean of Ely, says that worship, contemplation and study is their proper work. The recent Bishop of Truro, now Archbishop of Canterbury, gives the first place to the education of candidates for orders and to a body of unattached clergy called Missioners. The views of each have doubtless been affected by his personal experience.

It goes without saying that the structure of the Cathedral body should in its details

consist with its circumstances. No one pattern will answer for all. What is apt and good for one may not suit another.

What then is a Cathedral? How does it differ from any other Church? The name is derived from the Latin. The seat of a Bishop in a Church was his *Cathedra.* In and from this his seat he especially exercised his office. He had but one seat in his diocese which was in his Church; he had none in parish Churches. Soon what was peculiar to one Church gave it a distinctive name and the Bishop's Church was called a Cathedral. Properly the word is an adjective and qualifies Church. Speaking exactly we should say Cathedral Church, *Cathedralis Ecclesia.* In common parlance the adjective is used as a noun, and dropping the word Church we say Cathedral.

The Cathedral then is the Church in which is the *Cathedra*, *Sedes*, see, or seat of the Bishop. It is his Church. He is sometimes said to be the pastor, and sometimes the rector of his diocese. And his Cathedral has been called the Parish Church, and the matrix

of the diocese. These words may be not always descriptive of the fact, but they convey one idea, that the Cathedral is the Bishop's Church and has relations of some sort to and connection in some way with the diocese. Many suppose that it must be a large and beautiful building; that the service must be choral, and that the clergy must be numerous. It is natural to expect all these of a Bishop's Church. But the Anglo-Saxon Bishops generally built their churches of wood, small in size and rude in construction. And they were truly Cathedrals. The choral service has long since ceased to be peculiar to Cathedrals, and one Priest serving at the altar with his Bishop may be the only clergyman. Size of building, mode of service, and number of clergy are accidents, accessories, circumstances; they are not essential to the Cathedral. What is essential is that the Church should be the peculiar place of the Episcopal function.

But when the Bishop has planted his see in any Church, other things naturally and al-

most necessarily gather around it. Especially will be collected a number of clergy to whom he will resort for aid and advice in carrying on his work. The Episcopal function is the primary and a number of clergy, larger or smaller, who assist him in the administration of the diocese is the secondary element of a Cathedral.

Having said all that is needful and our space will allow of the structure of these bodies, we pass on to inquire, what are the proper functions of Cathedrals? What is their special place in the organization of the Church? What service are they fitted to render over and above that of parish Churches? What are they for and can they do?

IV.

THE CHAPTER—THE BISHOP'S COUNCIL.

IT is not easy for us nowadays, to conceive what the Christian community was in the first century of the Church. Society accepts the Catholic faith. A respectful deference on all hands is paid to what is Christian. Men's hearts may not be regenerate, but their manners are gentle. The consequence is, that resistance is relaxed: those who are within the Church are under no strain in standing up against those who are without. If we go back to the early days and strive to realize the intensity of the life of the early Christians, we have no experience of our own to appeal to.

The Christian community was a body of men and women to the soul of each of whom had come a new light. It was a revelation let down from above before their very eyes; a

revelation for the first time in all the world's history opening up a view into the unseen world and the awful mysteries of human destiny. While yet it was a new, strange, startling, wondrous vision, it profoundly stirred all who once looked upon it. And it came in the tale of a life and a death so full of pathos that men's eyes overflowed and their hearts melted at the recital. But without, society was unutterably corrupt and vile; sensuality, superstition, atheism were on every hand. Popular amusements were altogether ungodly; the gravest thought, the noblest aspirations were of the earth earthy and tainted by evil contact; the national religion which multiplied the divinities, deified the emperors, and denied the one only and true God was abhorrent. Against this wickedness it was the mission of the early Christians to protest with their lifeblood. Their Lord of lords, and King of kings, was the eternal Trinity worshipped through the incarnate Son; and in proportion as the Roman State was leagued to uphold its adulterate

cultus, so the Christian commonwealth was banded around the universal Cross. Their very depths of veneration and passionateness of devotion made these men and women recoil from the touch of the vile world, and drove them together and bound them by the most sacred ties. Their society, isolated in the midst of the multitudes, took a corporate character and had a polity of its own, and was in truth *Civitas Dei.*

In this sacred family the Bishop was the father, and all the rest were his children. It was not only love they gave him for his tenderness and wisdom, but veneration also for his high office and his character which the office sanctified. Some pages back we saw how he guided the work to which all were devoted; that, namely, of converting the world. Now let us ask how this holy man must have carried himself among his brethren. He shared their intensity of devotion; he shrank with them from the misery without; he awaited the same destiny that they foresaw for themselves; and besides, ever in his ears rang the voice of

Jesus, "Feed my sheep;" "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another." He was their ruler. Did he lord it over them? Being what he was, and they what they were, all brethren together, he could not help but take them, or at least those who were competent, into his councils, and listen patiently, respectfully, reverently, gladly to what each had to say. There in those first days, under the pressure of the sin without and the love within, this custom grew up, of the Bishop taking council of his clergy.

When afterwards the purely diocesan system became modified by the parochial system, the clergy who were about the Bishop at his Cathedral succeeded to this right to share the Episcopal consultations, as they succeeded to almost all the other corporate rights of the whole clerical body. It became universal canon law that the Bishop must on certain subjects consult his Chapter before acting upon them.

Hence the Chapter has been called "the Senate of the diocese," and the Canons have been called "brothers of the Bishop." In

some statutes the duty of the Chapter is declared to be, "to aid the Bishop when the see is full, to supply his place when it is vacant." One great writer upon ecclesiastical law concludes from a mass of evidence, that everywhere "the clergy of Cathedral Churches formed one body with the Bishop, and entered into their share of the anxiety and into some association with his sacred sway." Another speaking of the Canons says "their principal duty was to assist the Bishop by their work and their counsels in the government of the Church." Reginald Pole says "the rationale and ground of instituting Canonries and Prebends in Churches was that they who are appointed to them, may assist the Bishop and aid him with counsel and work in the discharge of his office and divine things." Pius VII. when he suppressed every Cathedral in France, in 1801, re-erected Chapters because it was needful "to provide for Bishops having a council." Pius IX. though in 1851 he in turn invaded Chapters still treated them as constituting "the Senate and council of the

Bishops." Lord Bacon, after arguing from the fact that kings, judges and all authorities have councils, that Bishops have need of the like assistance by reason both of their own infirmity and the gravity of matters within their jurisdiction, says "that the Deans and Chapters were councils about the sees and chairs of Bishops at first, and were unto them a Presbytery or consistory, and intermeddled not only in the disposing of their revenues and endowments but more in jurisdiction ecclesiastical;" and he has much more to the same effect.

It was universal Canon Law, so all Canonists hold, that upon the Bishop's mandate the members of the Chapter were bound to assemble in their Chapter-house, and consider any subject which he brought before them relating to the Episcopal dignity, jurisdiction or administration. Upon these points he could at his pleasure demand their opinion. Upon others he was bound to ask it. They may be summed up under these heads: alienation of property, presentation to benefices in the patronage of

the Cathedral Church, union of such benefices, the making of loans, mortgages, etc., questions affecting the interest of the Chapter, as *e. g.* increase or diminution of the number of Canonries and making statutes; the creation of Archdeaconries, and the convening of synods.

At ordinations the Canons were the examiners; the Archdeacon of the Cathedral jurisdiction presented the candidates, and the Canons with the Bishop laid hands upon them. The Bishop nominated and the Canons installed the Prebends. Many more items of interesting information might be given but they would have little practical value as regards our immediate purpose.

The opinions of the Canons in Chapter were not taken by votes but were declared orally. Except in those matters which directly affected the Chapter in its corporate rights, in respect of which its concurrence was necessary, the decision of the question after the conference was with the Bishop; he was not bound to follow the advice given him. But in matters which concerned the Chapter as

such, the Bishop could not interfere; he could not even be present in Chapter when they were under discussion, unless he held a prebendal stall, in which case he attended in his capacity of Prebend and not of Bishop. These matters were, for instance, the management of the capitular estates, administering internal discipline, etc. The Dean had cure of souls of the whole Chapter and establishment of the Cathedral. A Vicar choral was usually detailed to the pastoral charge of the Cathedral-parish. The details of divine service and the regulation of the officers were within the scope of the Chapter. But when the Bishop attended service he directed the order himself, pronouncing the Absolution and Benediction. He had the right of visitation, when he could inquire into all interests and administration and enforce his injunctions for the correction of abuses.

These however are details. The matter which is important is this; that it was an institute that the Bishop might demand of his Chapter their advice upon any matter touching

the Episcopal dignity, jurisdiction and administration, and that this was undoubtedly drawn from a custom which obtained in Apostolic or post Apostolic days and which arose out of the circumstances of those times, and that the reason for it still survives. Indeed, it has been said that this function of acting as "the Senate of the diocese" and aiding the Bishop by advice and service is the one only essential quality of the Chapter. It may be seized of no estates; it may neglect the daily service; it may maintain neither schools nor houses of mercy, and yet remain a Chapter. But when it no longer shares the Episcopal labors nor yields the assistance of its counsel to the Bishop, it has no longer a right to be.

In the earlier constitutions of the American Church no provision was made for such assistance to the Bishop as Chapters rendered. There was little need of it. The Episcopal function was at that time greatly depressed, out of deference to the popular suspicion of a Church supposed to have an English lineage and a monarchical polity. Nor was there much occa-

sion for its activity; for among the religious bodies the Episcopal Church was almost the smallest and weakest. The Bishops were rectors of parish Churches to which they gave most of their services. Their Episcopal duties were slight, temporary and occasional. This sufficiently accounts for an omission which otherwise seems strange. But when the Bishops withdrew from subordinate duties, relations and offices to their proper sphere, and great interests came into their hands for a wise administration, and great activities on all sides exhausted their strength, the need began to be felt both by them and the other orders of some body to which they could resort for counsel in the discharge of their duties.

The question was what this body should be; how it should be raised; what should be its place? With wise judgment under the circumstances the men of those days did not attempt to create a new one, but they made use of the standing committee of the diocese. This body had long been familiar, and it had been charged with other usual duties of the Chap-

ter. Accordingly, in 1835 a canon was passed by the General Convention providing that "in every diocese where there is a Bishop the standing committee shall be a council of advice to the Bishop. They shall be summoned on the requisition of the Bishop whenever he shall wish for their advice; and they may meet of their own accord agreeably to their own rules when they may be disposed to advise the Bishop."

It is interesting to notice how in conditions very unlike any which ever obtained in any other country, there was developed a sense of the necessity of the service which the Chapters had rendered. The recurrence of a function at different periods and under different circumstances proves that it is not accidental and temporal. It may be said that the standing committee being the Bishop's council of advice there is no need of the Chapter for that purpose. That would be a complete answer to the contention in behalf of the Cathedral and its Chapter so far as the function under discussion goes,

if the jurisdiction of the standing committee extended to all the affairs, interests and administration of the diocese. In that case it would be only a matter of name. The body which should give assistance to the Bishop by its counsel and advice, in respect of the dignity and jurisdiction of the episcopate and the administration and regimen of the diocese would be the same, whether it were called the Chapter or the standing committee. But the jurisdiction of the committee is not so extensive. Its duties are of the very highest and most solemn nature, but they are limited to a very small part of the episcopal administration. For instance, the committee does not have the care of the missions of the diocese. That is an interest the most active, urgent and pressing of all. It is entrusted to the care of another, separate, disconnected and independent body called variously, the board of missions, the committee on missions, or the missionary society. When a question touching missions has been determined by the body

charged with their care it would be, not only unseemly, but mischievous in every way, for the Bishop to go to the standing committee for advice on the subject. It would be raising the committee to an appellate jurisdiction and subordinating to it all other bodies. Confusion and irritation would follow which would be intolerable. And what is true of missions and the board charged with them, is true of all other interests of the diocese, which are parcelled out among different similar bodies. It thus appears that most of the administration of the diocese being given into the hands of other bodies than the standing committees, it is impracticable for it to be a council of advice to the Bishop on only a modicum of the subjects in the discussion, consideration and determination of which he needs assistance. It is very clear therefore that the standing committee of a diocese does not answer all the needs which the Bishop may have for assistance in the way of advice. As his council, as the Senate of the diocese it does not fill the place of the Chapter.

It may be further insisted that, while the standing committee may assist the administration as a council of advice in respect of a limited number of subjects, yet the other bodies which are charged with them supply its insufficiencies. Possibly so; but this brings us to the question whether the Bishop shall have several councils among which the administration shall be distributed, each with its own small share, or the whole shall be vested in a single body. The former scheme has heretofore generally obtained. In the older dioceses it is the settled policy with which people are familiar. It is not likely to be given up for anything new. Where, however, things are in a formative state the other plan of diocesan organization may well be carefully thought of. This much may be said for it, that the Chapter holds its own proper historical place only as a council to assist the Bishop by advice and work. Further than that we do not press the contention.

V.

THE CATHEDRAL—A MISSIONARY ESTABLISHMENT.

BETWEEN the idea of the Cathedral and a missionary agency there is to many persons an incongruity almost ludicrous. They cannot help thinking of the Cathedral as standing apart from the practical and active realities of to-day. To them it is an historical institution; age, great names, and great events have consecrated it by the highest, most sacred and most affecting associations. Their vision is full of the beauty and the majesty of the most glorious shrines man ever built to worship at, and their ears are full of the exquisite melodies and the lofty anthems of a divine service. To them these places are the abodes of elegant scholarship, pious contemplation, exquisite life. Perhaps they know them not only in pictures by pen and pencil, but have walked in the cloisters

and close, hall, library and chamber; meeting in all the purprise hardly one of the dwellers there, and hearing hardly any sound but that of their own footfall, even though in the heart of a great city, and have felt that here are perfect calm and most affluent conditions. And when they strive to think of the place as thronged with missionaries, and noisy with the comings and goings to and from the distant mission station, and all alive with business that is concerned about unchristian, ignorant, rude people, they revolt at what seems to them a desecration.

But our apology is not of the Cathedral of other countries, nor any such conception of it, whether it be right or wrong. We have to do with the institution in our land and our generation. This is a new country with rude conditions: the mass of the people are without the pale of the Church and know very little of her ways. The Cathedral, with missionary fields lying close about it must, if it is to exist here at all, be an institution of work; of plain, common, every-day, hard work. Elsewhere, it may be

the luxury of an establishment; here, in order to get for itself a place it must show that it is more efficient than other agencies for bringing these peoples to the blessings which abound with the children of the Church.

There is a general doubt of the competency of the Cathedral for this service. But let this institution show that it can be useful practically, in this behalf, that is to say, that it can do what men can see the good of at a glance, and nothing else will remain to be done in the way of apology.

Referring to what has already been shown to be of the essence of the Cathedral, namely that it is a Church in which is the Bishop's seat, where he gathers his clergy or certain of them, and by the aid of their counsel administers his function, and whence by the aid of their services he carries forward the work of his diocese, personally, actively, particularly, and co-extensively with its bounds, we have to answer the question how this system can be a vigorous, efficient, economical, and profitable missionary agency.

For the purpose of noting the conditions of the various missionary fields into which the Cathedral has been or is to be introduced, and of observing more narrowly the methods in which it must operate, we may divide them roughly into three classes.

1. There are, firstly, those regions which the Church has not penetrated, as for instance pagan countries, Indian reservations, and missionary jurisdictions when first erected.

2. There are, secondly, the new and sparsely populated states, where the work has begun and has been carried on by parochial organizations.

3. There remain, thirdly to be noticed, the well settled states, where the ground has been well occupied by parishes.

Beginning with the regions first mentioned, we may rejoice that there is one point which has been fixed. Formerly, it was an open question much debated and finally answered with hesitancy and doubt, whether the Church should go into new and to her unknown regions in the care of the lower orders of clergy,

and the work of planting her institutions there should be begun in a desultory, accidental, haphazard way, and afterwards, when parishes had been started here and there, Bishops should be sent out as an ornamental complement of the system, or whether the Bishop should go at the head of the forces in command of the army of observation, select the strategic points, plan the campaign, and himself bear the severities of the arduous work. Almost in our generation the policy of the Church on that point has been settled once and forever. It was one step and a very long step towards that system of missionary enterprise, the center and principle of which is the Cathedral. It is the postulate of our contention. Our inquiry is a narrower one: it is how shall the Bishop carry himself when sent to such regions. Shall he keep at the head and in the van of the army, or shall he retire to some place of safety; shall he personally wield the discipline, cheer the spirits and order the movements of his forces, with the force and vigor and authority which one

not present on the field can never have, or shall his arm drop nerveless and the battle, once set in order, be without a commander; shall he mass his men and make a strong post where what is gained will be safe and thence make incursions into the enemy's country when and where and as he sees can be done effectively, or shall he disperse his forces, putting one man here and another there and a third still farther off, and leave each alone to do the best he can for himself? In a word, shall he be a general or a subaltern, a Bishop or a Deacon; and shall the policy be co-operation or isolation?

If this line of remark be too general to assist the argument, and if it rest on an analogy that is not apt enough to prove much, then we appeal to what has been done by others in other times. The conditions of a Bishop going into regions where the Church is unknown are not greatly unlike those in which the Gospel was first preached. In pagan countries the conditions are almost precisely those of ancient Britain. In the new missionary juris-

dictions there is a difference, only to a degree. There are not cities, an old religion, a refined philosophy, a dissatisfied conscience, and an uncertain and anxious hope, as in Greece and Italy and the provinces of imperial Rome. Nor, on the other hand, are there the paganism and semibarbarism of Britain. But in an unorganized society in which all the moral restraints of old communities are relaxed, religion in any of its forms holds sway over the practices, hearts and purposes of very very few; and efforts in behalf of a better order of things are initiatory, indecisive, uncertain, unsuccessful and not infrequently illegitimate. Whatever differences there may be are incidental and for our present purpose trifling. In their important and necessary circumstances the societies to whom the apostles and first Bishops were sent and those on our frontier are much the same. We may then well ask, why the methods of the early days should not now be followed. We know how efficient those methods were then. By means of them was wrought that great

miracle of history, the world's conversion from the old mythology to the faith of the despised sect of the Christian, and the regeneration of society from superstition and vile corruption to a comparative purity of morals and character. There must have been something in the ways of those by whom that revolution was effected, not to be cast aside and held for nought even in these days.

But we do not need to appeal to a remote antiquity, for facts to support our contention. We have examples at hand in our own times of various characters. For instance, there are the missionaries in heathen countries of religious denominations which do not have Bishops, but whose ministers are of one order. The structure and methods of these adventures are essentially those of the Cathedral. The missionaries live together, if not always under one roof yet in a community by themselves, separate from the vice, ignorance and superstition about them: they draw their support from a common treasury: they are associated for a common work,

the whole scheme of which is laid out for them and apportioned among them, and the whole establishment is under the presidency of a chief officer. An example is the mission of the American board of foreign missions at Beyrout of which Dr. Jessup is the head. It has grown to large proportions, so that offshoots have sprung up somewhat remote from the central body. And yet with all the encouragement that has been given them, under the system of parity of orders, these separate stations decline to be isolated and cannot be raised into independence. There remains the home establishment which still cares for its children in remote parts, and to which they look for succor and affection. And almost all the missions of these bodies are planted and constructed on the same plan. It is a very interesting fact that these missionaries not infrequently felicitate themselves upon their similitude to the apostolic methods.

This illustration drawn as it is from the experience of non-episcopal Christians who decline the names and titles and settled

order of the early Church is an extreme one: it may be a distasteful one to some who do not like to learn from an enemy. But for the very reason that it is drawn from such alien conditions it has the greater force. When we see societies in very remote periods, under civilizations very unlike, springing up under most diverse polities, taking on the same form, and following the same methods, we must admit that there is at any rate a strong probability that that structure and those modes are not only good but the very best. The example we have given and its coincidence with the Apostolic system may not decisively prove that Missions can be better worked by communities of missionaries under the direction of a chief officer, but it certainly goes a good ways to support the contention.

But we do not need to go to the experience of other denominations nor to other countries. We have examples at home in our own country. Bishop Hare's Missions among the Indians are all associate. At each is a con-

siderable force of clergy, teachers and helpers of both sexes and both races, all living together and working together under his observation. If the dependent populations were considerably more numerous and the missionary force greater, the system would be almost precisely that of the Minsters in England in the tenth century. A proposition to disintegrate these bodies, distribute these forces, and isolate these missionaries would be received by them with consternation.

If that example is peculiar, another is at hand. The jurisdiction committed to Bishop Tuttle when he was first sent to the West, was so very extensive that it was physically impossible to work it all from one center; but he organized the Utah Mission upon the Cathedral system. He made his home in Salt Lake City, the chief town of the Territory; he associated his clergy together here; he built St. Mark's Cathedral, a structure of considerable size, beauty, solidity, and dignity; he surrounded it with first-rate schools for boys and girls; he established a large and

well appointed hospital; he gathered around him there a force of men and women, himself in the midst the grand figure of an Apostle; and the close association, common work, intense devotion, and lofty aspiration of the society have deeply impressed the hardest, most untoward population, both Mormon and Gentile, a Christian missionary ever worked upon. It must not be supposed that Bishop Tuttle's work took the consistency and expression of the Cathedral system. It did not do so, although that is a consummation devoutly wished by him. But it had the substance of it, as one can see by laying our description of the Cathedral alongside our very brief account of his work and his method of doing it.

Let us follow him a little farther into the possibilities. Suppose the benevolence of the Church had been generous enough to have given him an ample clergy house and clergymen to fill it, who should live together under his eye and work under his direction. What must have happened? His manly, vigorous,

stalwart spirit arouses the Christian manhood in every one of them. A depth of devotion fed at the altar at which they all continually come; a zeal for work stimulated by sight of what each is doing; an exaltation of life and intensity of spirit, apt to become morbid in isolation but healthy and transcendent in association, pervade the community. Each as he is sent, goes to his allotted task, whether far or near, carrying the wisdom his Bishop has taught him, the fervency of the early Christian, and the self-abnegation of the martyrs. And when the period of his return has come he turns his face in gladness to his home and Church and Father in God. What sort of work throughout the borders of the jurisdiction will in a few years be done by a body of men working in that way, and what sort of men will they become after a few years of such a life it is not hard to tell.

This is not a fancy sketch. Wherever the least attempt has been made to work in that way, good promise of all we have imagined has been given. And it must be so, for it is

according to a certain law of human nature; a law which is just as immutable as that which governs the society of the stars. When men come together, live, strive, think, feel, and hope all together for one purpose, what always happens? The end they aim for becomes exaggerated in their eyes; their efforts to gain it exhausts their strength; their resistance to whatever opposes them is violent; their devotion is uncompromising; and their life intense. The reason is plain. Each bringing into the association his share of zeal and interest and feeling stimulates the zeal, interest, and feeling of every other. The most notable example is an army. You may see it also in trades unions, schools, professions, and guilds.

When men are associated for the purpose of our divine religion this law operates with the very highest force. The mystery of the early Christian Church is solved by this law of human nature and the miracle of the world's conversion is explained on the simplest grounds. Human nature is the same

now as then; why should not a system which avails itself of that law be resorted to by us?

But some timid soul may say that neither the money nor the men are forthcoming for such a mission. As for men, if the picture were put before the eyes of the ingenuous, studious, right-minded youth of the schools and colleges of this country they would forget, or some fair number of them would forget the lesson they are always being taught, that money and ease and fat living are the good things of life, and would long to turn their backs on it and hasten to join that company. When Doctor Breck planted his mission in the unknown West an enthusiasm for it ran through the Church. These are better days than those. A large project such as is above suggested must excite an interest that will far outrun anything he ever heard or thought of. And as for money it will not be wanting. When the interest of the Church was aroused in Indian missions, how means beyond any use poured in from every hand. It will always be so. Let a great Bishop like him of Utah once

get the ear of churchmen and churchwomen, and tell them of his Cathedral, and that to save his people he must realize once more the life and work and spirit of the early times and his treasury will be filled. It is just one of those stories which catch and fire the imaginations of men.

2. The conditions of those regions into which the Church has entered and made some headway, working by the aid of parish organizations, but which remain almost wholly missionary fields, present a problem less simple and soluble. Before entering upon its discussion, two remarks may be made, for the purpose of forestalling what is likely to be objected to our contention.

The first is, that between the Parish and the Cathedral there should be no hostility, rivalry, or collision. The two systems, the parochial and the cathedral, are entirely congruous. The Parish is an entity, having its own organization, property, administration, and function. It is safe from any invasion, being hedged about by constitutional provisions.

It cannot be absorbed by the Cathedral, and it ought not to be. No scheme of Cathedral organization can possibly supply its place.

The other point to be noted is, that the mission ought not always to be a mission. Planted in a new soil, while yet weak and needing support, and until it grows in strength and force so that it can stand and go alone, it must depend upon the help and sustenance of the power which gave it being. The child must be led; the man must walk alone. The Cathedral must not for the sake of ambition or self-aggrandizement, retain in its hands any part of its missionary work one moment after it is done. When that is accomplished, the mission should be erected into a parish. There is not much danger of any attempt to do otherwise, so long as the exigencies of missionary enterprise are severe. Generations to come are not likely to see them less pressing than they are now. But the disclaimer is not ill-timed, while prejudices are rife against what men are so ready to take for and stigmatize as centralization.

Now let us go on to consider the conditions of the regions secondly above mentioned, and the fitness of the Cathedral system to meet them. Here, as in the countries of which we have been speaking, there are wide spaces which the Church has not penetrated. We need hardly say that they must be occupied in the same way as the missionary jurisdictions. Their circumstances are not qualified by the fact that there are parishes remote from them although within the same diocese; they draw no sustenance from them. It is when we enter territory partially occupied by parishes that different conditions are presented. Between these partially occupied and the vacant fields there is this difference. While in the latter, the missionary looks to the Cathedral as his home, no matter how long his absences, and he works as a member of a community under the direct eyes and order of the Bishop, in the former, he has his home in the parish, and gives to it his labors and comes up to the Cathedral at intervals and for short periods.

The situation of a missionary on the frontier is not altogether happy. He lives almost alone; no fellow workman is near; months pass without his looking on the face of a brother. When that pleasure is given him it is so brief that the chill of strangeness is not broken: there is little opportunity for sympathy and confidence. The flock generally gives little support to the yearning heart of the Pastor: rather do the people draw upon it for sympathy and comfort in their sorrows and spiritual wants. The isolation is absolute. The influence of his situation upon his character is anything but good. He may begin his work with ever so much promise, but often his zeal abates. Without stimulus to keep up his reading he is likely to neglect his books. He seldom meets any one whose conversation rouses him to hard, deep, and earnest thinking, and he settles down into ruts and is satisfied with words. He is apt to become narrow in his views of men, society, and affairs, and less and less fit to lead and guide the thought of his people. With this deterioration of his mental

powers, a dryness creeps over his religious sensibilities, and his piety, still kept alive by the exercises of his holy office, loses freshness of expression. Any Bishop of such a field can tell many a sad tale of the young priest of whom he hoped much and who has disappointed him grievously. And, on the other hand, the man who has strength to bear up under these untoward circumstances, seeking a holier communion than the society of men, and finding refreshment in his studies, demands our sympathy almost as much as his weaker brother. To any one devoted to religion, solitude has the intensest trials and sorrows. What does not introspection reveal? What solicitude about duties? What anxieties over weariness of spirit? What agony when the heart does not respond to the words of the lip, in the solemn and awful services of the Church? These are the cares and sorrows of the priest to whom it is given to be faithful in solitude. Be it said to the honor of these men and the glory of God, most missionaries are of this holy sort. If

anything can be done to alleviate their condition it is as much a duty as the care of the sick, the orphan and the destitute.

There is a practical mode of relief, I had almost said redemption, of missionary clergy to be found in the Cathedral system. This sounds extravagant; but I believe a few words are enough to make the statement good to fair-minded churchmen. Suppose there were at the Cathedral a hall; and twice or four times or a dozen times a year as should be appointed him, the missionary should come up for a brief residence in it. Here he would meet and know and learn to love those who like him were devoted by vow and habit and zeal to the service of their common Lord; here he would find companionship and sympathy and affections and a freshened life and an animated spirit, such as come only from the warmth and fervor of association; here he would find the guidance and direction and counsel of his Bishop, and the elder and the wiser of the clergy; here he would see the need of reading to keep pace with the prog-

ress of others by whose conversation he would be stimulated to exertion; here, above all, he would have the altar at which to kneel in the highest act of worship and the splendid services of the temple. And so he would be strengthened against the trials of his lot among the people to whom he is sent, and against those other trials of the spirit. His stay need not be long; even a few days might suffice to return him to his work a new man.

But the missionary is not the only person who would be blessed by this relief. Coming up at stated times, he would, either by express rule or in the natural course, report to the Bishop of his work, his field, and his life. The peculiar needs of the stations he serves, and his aptness to answer them would become known; and he would be instructed by wise counsels and encouraged to go on, or be reinforced by others or withdrawn to some other place for which he would seem better fitted, as the case required. Missionaries thus organized and working from the Ca-

thedral would in a very few years become a homogeneous body, having common interests, modes, sentiments, and aspirations. There would soon grow up among them an *esprit de corps*, without which no society was ever efficient.

If it be said that this is the idle fondness of hope, I appeal to experience in other departments of life. It is safe to say that there never was a successful trading or manufacturing establishment, whose employees were not bound together and to the interests which they served, and made to feel that they had a share in the enterprise. It is human nature that it should be so. Why then in the Church where men are moved by the same impulses, should the lessons of experience and observation be ignored? Co-operation is the first element in social progress: why should the Church adhere to a policy of isolation?

3. The old and well settled States have need of the same machinery as the new missionary jurisdictions if they contain wide unoccupied territories; and the same organization as the

new dioceses if they have many weak parishes partially dependent upon outside aid. Passing these by, we come to what is peculiar in their circumstances and needs. We have to ask the indulgence of the reader and beg him to turn back these pages to the extracts we have made from Bishop Benson and Bishop Sweatman and read them again in this connection. They enlighten the subject of the practical uses of Cathedrals, more than the same number of words from the pen of any other writer. They leave nothing to be said here.

VI.

THE DAILY OFFICE.

THE first duty of the Cathedral clergy is the maintenance in a becoming manner of the services of the sanctuary. I say their first, but not their peculiar duty; for it belongs to the whole body of those who are set apart to minister unto the Lord in His holy temple. Nor would I say that daily morning and evening prayer any more than the weekly Holy Eucharist is the peculiar duty of those who serve at the Cathedral. It, too, is a duty common to them and to the parish clergy. Every Church in the diocese should be open every day for the prayers which are appointed to be said at matins and at eventide, and should resound on Sundays and festivals with the accents of the highest Christian worship, which our Lord Himself

instituted. But this is not practicable in all parish Churches: it is vain to expect it. But the doors of the Cathedral, the mother of all the Churches, should never on any account be closed at the times appointed for these services. And there is another duty which is peculiar to the Cathedral clergy: that duty is, to perform the service in the most solemn and impressive manner, with every circumstance of reverent worship. Every member of the Cathedral body should be required to be in his place, and every act be studiously done which should make these services fit for the holy place, and fit for the Holy One Who dwells there,—as fit, I mean, as any human offering can be worthy of His acceptance.

> "He set singers also before the altar, that
> By their voices they might make sweet melody,
> And sing daily praises in their songs.
> He beautified their feasts and set in order
> The solemn times, until the end, that they
> Might praise His holy name, and that the
> Temple might sound from morning."

It is not becoming me to enforce this duty. Nor do I need to do so. Another has done

it with the pious fervor with which all his writings are instinct. Dean Goulburn, of Norwich, England, some years ago published a little volume of sermons on the Cathedral system, in which he sets forth and enforces the duty of maintaining the daily office as chiefly devolving upon the Cathedral clergy. It is a book which all who are interested in our subject should read before any other. I shall make some extracts from it which will give the gist of what he says upon this particular subject. Speaking of the "practical account to which cathedrals may be turned, both congruous and dignified," he says:

"The principle which, I believe, lies at the root of the question on which we are entering is this: that the honor of Almighty God is an end of human action, distinct from and even superior to the good of man."

After a beautiful and forcible application of the incident of the woman anointing our Lord's feet with the gift of great value, and His commendation of the act in answer to the murmur of the disciples, he says: "But

our Lord will have none of their calculations; terminates them prematurely. 'This is no waste,' He virtually says; 'it is no prodigality, unless indeed it be the noble prodigality of faith, and zeal, and love. She is honoring Me, even though she be not succoring the poor; and, moreover, it is an opportunity of paying Me honor which is rarely vouchsafed to men. Ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will, ye may do them good: but Me ye have not always.'

. . . . . .

"I trust that I have opened a way by these remarks for the discernment of the true character of the *Cathedral* Church. It is a building specially and prominently dedicated to the glory of Almighty God. I say *specially* and *prominently;* and it is by this specialty and prominence that I believe a Cathedral to be distinguished from other Churches. All Churches are, of course, in one aspect of them, offerings to God for the honor of His name. But then this is not the leading, but the subordinate idea in a parochial Church. The pri-

mary object there is the dealing with human souls, the converting and softening of human hearts, the stirring and awakening of human consciences, the initiating the worshipper into the knowledge of God, and the gradual drawing of him up into communion with God. Nor is this end in the least degree foreign to the functions of a Cathedral; rather it is a part of its functions, only not the most prominent part, not the great characterizing idea. The Cathedral is a place rather where God is worshipped than where man is impressed, though it is a most blessed thing indeed where the latter end is secured along with the former. 'Make our Cathedrals popular,' they exclaim, 'by drawing to them large congregations, and inducing effective preachers to address the goodly throng.' 'By all means,' I would reply, 'unspeakably blessed is the work, wheresoever or by whomsoever done, of turning a soul to righteousness, or leading it on in righteousness—make the Cathedrals as serviceable in this way as you possibly can; but do not, in a fit of indiscreet zeal, confuse or obliterate their

leading idea; do not parochialize, or turn them into vast parish Churches. The very core and center of all their proceedings is not a sermon to the masses (excellent as that is in its season, and oh! that we had more of such sermons, and more of that sort of preacher who has the happy tact of stirring the soul and conscience!), but the daily office in the choir, solemn, effective, dignified; rendered as perfect as possible by the accessory of beautiful music, and ever striving and yearning to represent more perfectly upon earth the adoration which ceaselessly goes on in the courts of heaven. The anthem is quite in place in such worship; nor surely should anthems ever be discontinued in Cathedrals, though unsuited (in my judgment) to the worship of parochial Churches. To discard anthems from Cathedrals would be to discard some of the grandest efforts of music to praise the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, from those very houses of prayer which are, in a more especial manner, dedicated to the celebration of the glories of His name.'"

. . . . . .

"But let us look a little more closely into the *rationale* of the Temple services, and see whether the ground of maintaining, under the new dispensation, something analogous to them has ceased. It appears then to have been the purpose of the divine wisdom to construct upon earth a little model or miniature of the worship carried on in heaven. Heaven may be regarded as the home of the human family, from which they have strayed by sin, but to which the saved are eventually to be brought back through Christ. Heaven is the bosom and dwelling place of the Father of our spirits, to which Christ instructs us to lift up our minds when we pray, 'Our Father, which art in heaven.' It is easy to understand, then, that in the ears of His chosen people (and His chosen people were of old the Jews) God would wish to sound ever and anon echoes of heaven, echoes of its worship and its praise, that He would wish to submit to their eyes continually something which, however dimly and mysteriously, should remind them of their high destiny, and waken in them an aspiration for it.

But that there was, whatever may have been the ground of it, a real and designed connection between the worship carried on in heaven and the Temple service, is clear from the words of the Apostle to the Hebrews: 'There are priests who offer gifts according to law: who serve *unto the example and shadow of heavenly things* as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, see, saith He, that thou shalt make all things *according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.*' Yes; 'unto the example and shadow,' 'according to the pattern.' Heaven is 'the true' (or antitypical) 'tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.' Our Lord Jesus Christ is the High Priest of this tabernacle, who presents there continually His blood and merits, and offers also the prayers of His people, made fragrant with the incense of His own intercession. Nor is His mediation for sinful man in Heaven to be limited to times subsequent to His appearance on earth. It is only in virtue of His foreseen sacrifice and intercession that believing Israelites were accepted of old; and though His

atonement was made in time, it was foreordained of God from all eternity, and sinners dealt with in mercy on the ground of it, for which reason He is called 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.' He, then, even before His assumption of human nature, was the mediating High Priest of the true tabernacle. And of this tabernacle the holy angels are the subordinate ministers; they form its choir and its worshippers, and surround the throne of God and the Lamb with chants of praise, which cease not day and night. Now the dark similitude of this worship was expressed in the various arrangements of the Temple service. The High Priest passing annually into the holy place with incense and blood was a figure of Christ mediating, by His atonement, which was transacted on earth (in the outer court of God's temple), and His intercession, which is transacted in Heaven; and the subordinate Priest and Levites, whether in their ministries of sacrifice or song, represented the angels. We must suppose that to spiritually-minded Israelites these emblems were

not merely and utterly dark, that, as they prayed and meditated on what little was made known to them (whether in the law or by tradition) of God's counsels, the meaning of the Temple service was partially cleared up; and if so, we cannot wonder that these services, waking in their mind the far-off echo of heavenly things, should have proved to them so great a refreshment of spirit as we know from the psalms they did.

"Now I remark, first, that though the outward form of worship rendered to Almighty God under the Old Testament dispensation has been abrogated, though we are no longer called upon to do homage to Him with burnt-offerings, or sacrifice for sin, or sweet incense, one main ground upon which we must suppose Temple worship to have been instituted—namely, to keep alive in the minds of God's people a continual aspiration after their heavenly home—still remains. Though our religious light is in many respects much clearer than that which the Jews enjoyed, yet we still 'walk by faith, not by sight,' and therefore

have as much need as they of some miniature and model of heavenly worship, to be under our eyes continually, and to remind us of the occupations and pursuits in which we hope to pass our eternity. Churches closed from Sunday to Sunday, or opened only at intervals, however beneficial may be the influence of the services occasionally held in them, do not do this with sufficient emphasis; for heaven's temple is never closed, nor, although its blessed inhabitants are employed on God's errands in different parts of the universe, does its song of praise ever cease;—'They rest not day and night, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.' But great central churches where worship is never silent, where it is carried on with the unvarying regularity of the dawn and the nightfall, uninterrupted by the most startling events whether of a public or a private character, and changeless in its accents and features amid a world which is full of change, such churches as these do help to make an audible echo of the infinitely sweet and sol-

emn worship which is carried on in God's heavenly temple, and are as fresh flowers to a captive in a dungeon, or sweet chimes in a dreary night, mementoes midst the darkness of this life of what is beautiful and holy."

. . . . . .

"So that in the worship of the Christian Church, while the outward form is in many respects utterly different, the spirit and principle of Temple worship still survives. Both are attempts on the part of God's Church Militant to express on earth the unseen and sublime worship of His Church Triumphant; both contain representations, both by God's own finger, of Divine things, the latter having the substance as well as the shadow of those things, the former the shadow only—and both are characterized by one great common feature, noble hymns of praise—that spiritual exercise, which is the expression of the grace of love, as prayer is the expression of the grace of faith, and which like love, shall survive, when the necessity for prayer has passed away." . . . . . .

"The great thought which has been the subject of the present discourse, and which I wish to leave upon your minds as the sum and substance of what has been said, is that the worship of the Christian Church is designed to be, and ought to be, an echo of the worship which is ever proceeding in heaven. If it differs from that of the Temple, it differs, not in being less expressive of things unseen and divine, but in being less enigmatical, and so more clearly and plainly expressive—not in having less of that element which touches the feelings and kindles the heart, but only in having more of that element which enlightens the understanding. It is no doubt, as compared with Temple worship, a reasonable service; but it has lost nothing of that power of moving the sympathies of the soul, which Temple worship exerted to such a remarkable degree, as is witnessed by such devout aspirations as these:—

"'One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold

the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire in His temple.'—'How amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts! my soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God. . . . Blessed are they who dwell in Thy house: they will be still praising Thee. . . . . For a day in Thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.'—'Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy house, and the place where Thine honor dwelleth.'"

VII.

ACCESSORIES.

WE have now seen unfolded before our eyes a distinct and definite view of the Cathedral: a Church having the Bishop's seat, where the Episcopal function is in an especial way shone forth and exercised as the primary quality; having also a number of clergy who aid him in the exercise of his office of administrator of the diocese, first, by their council, and then by their labors, as the secondary quality. This body of clergy rendering their service after a twofold manner, namely, first, by the maintenance of the stately and worthy worship of Almighty God in the Temple, and secondly, by free, large, generous ministrations unto the destitute throughout the jurisdiction or in supplement to others' work,

is the third characteristic of the institution And this is a full view of the essential qualities of the Cathedral. Whatever more is added is not essential but is accessory to it. But as the exigencies of society and the Church have from time to time demanded activities in other ways, these institutions have grown by accretion so that what strictly is not needed to their completeness has become usefully, presently and generally a part of them. This is only according to a natural and common law of development of almost all institutions. Schools, for instance, are primarily for the instruction of youth, but many have become seats of learning and places of original research. Armies and navies are organized to fight battles on the land and on the sea; but officers are detailed to many other kinds of service and institutions are established for purposes very remote from the business of war; as for instance the signal service, the naval observatory, engineering works in aid of commerce. No view of the Cathedral is at all

adequate which does not take in its incidental institutions.

1. In their effort to find reasons which the popular mind will readily appreciate for keeping the English Cathedrals sacred to their own purposes, and also for enlarging their practical uses, it has been a favorite scheme with their apologists that schools for candidates for holy orders should be organized in connection with them, and the Canons be charged with the business of instruction. And this is but a revival of an ancient use. One of the chief designs of Cranmer in his organization of the Cathedrals of the new foundation, was "to make them nurseries of young divines for the service of the Church, trained in the study of divinity under the immediate inspection of the Bishops, Deans, and Chapters." And this was only bringing in again an office and employment when Cathedrals were at their highest dignity and service. There were the best of reasons in early times for what was done in this behalf; and they

doubtless remain in England to this day. Under the stress of the most urgent need of more clergy than they know how to get, many a Bishop in this country has undertaken to supply the want by a divinity school of his own. Almost all Cathedral organizations in our country contemplate them. The examples of ancient times and the recent expressions and endeavors in England have given strength to the notion that they are the natural if not essential appendages of Cathedrals.

But the circumstances here are altogether unlike those of England. There the Church is a great national establishment: here she is an inconsiderable body. There a diocese is a great Christian empire: here it is not much more than a hamlet in comparison. It is simply impossible for each diocese to have a well equipped school of scientific theology. The men for teachers, the means for their support, the houses and halls, and, above all, the candidates in numbers are not to be had. Small schools with limited facil-

ities, which is all they can have, are unequal to the thorough education of candidates. A great school with liberal endowments, a faculty of professors who are men of learning and character, with an ample library, dignified and venerable buildings, extensive grounds, and goodly numbers of scholars have a certain special qaulity. There is an air in the place, a flavor in the life, a fine quality in the scholarship, a dignity in the manhood of the collegiate society that make or go far to make good breeding. This may be seen in the great colleges of our country. It is a proverb in all descriptions of Oxford and Cambridge and of the men trained there. Such institutions and their advantages are to be had in our country, only by several dioceses uniting for their most liberal support in every way. They may well be in connection with a Cathedral, but they cannot be at every Cathedral.

But there remains a training of the young clergyman at every Cathedral that is proper and necessary. After he has graduated in divinity, he has much to be taught before he

can safely be entrusted with the cure of souls. He needs to learn how to meet and deal with men of all sorts and to get skill in the use of the treasuries of learning he has been gathering. This can be learned, not out of books or from lectures, but by going out and actually doing the thing under the eye and teaching of a man trained to the task, who should be a Canon. The preparation for the other professions is not deemed complete until the scholastic curriculum is supplemented by practical instruction. The young man who has completed his courses of lectures at the medical college thinks he must spend some years in the hospital; and he who has taken his degree in the law is required to study a certain term in the office of a counselor before he is admitted to the bar. Surely preparation for the work of the cure of men's souls should not be more imperfect than that of the cure of men's bodies or the care of their estates.

The Cathedral is the very place for this sort of training. Here is the clergy-house

in which the young Deacon may live in company with the missionaries, learning of them, catching their spirit, and looking forward to a share in their work; here are the Canons and the Bishop to guide and instruct him by personal, conversational, and familiar teachings; and here in the missions of the see city, in the services of the Cathedral and in the simple, frugal, devout, and holy life of the community he learns to do the work and walk in the ways of a priest of the Church.

2. We once heard the eloquent Bishop of Northern Texas say with deep emotion, that the sorest trial of the parish priest was the duty of celebrating the Holy Communion under the compulsion of inexorable appointment, when his heart within him did not respond to the sacred office. The pathetic words in which he described the suffering cannot be reproduced. We state the point in the baldest way. The round of daily duty, the sympathies constantly drawn upon, the fears excited by the sights of evil and wrong on every side, the exhaustion of much watch-

ing and care, even the dulness that is so apt to come to the most devout and vivacious spirit, all press upon the parish priest with such severity that, without some help, he must be subjected to trials such as the Bishop described. There must be danger of a settled consciousness of his own unfitness for his sacred office, and of the unreality of his life in it. It is only the common experience of all men that this should be so. The lawyer, the physician, the man of affairs, grows dull and heavy and unequal to his tasks after long terms of application. He must have periods of relaxation and change of scene and vacations of perfect rest. If he do not take them the end comes very soon. And the clergyman is like all others; save that there is no part of man's nature which tires so soon and breaks down so utterly as that, in the constant exercise of which the parish priest lives. Nor is he the only one who suffers. His ministrations cannot help lacking freshness, liveliness, vigor and force; and they to whom they are given are the first to observe and

complain of the defect although the cause may be beyond their ken.

Among all the deficiencies of the Church not one is so great and so pressing as the want of some remedy for this evil. If we were not too proud and too prejudiced to act upon the maxim of worldly wisdom, learn from your enemy, we might find in the discipline of the Roman Catholic clergy the needed remedy. They have what they call "retreats," when the clergy are required to quit their homes and regular duties, go into residence at an appointed time and place, and submit themselves to a special discipline for a period. Surely when the retreat is dissolved and the devout priest is returned to his duty he must carry with him a body and heart refreshed by its holy exercises.

We have shown the need of a hall at the Cathedral for the residence of the missionaries of the diocese, and the Deacons serving in the see city. Provision for the entertainment of the parochial clergy could here easily be made. At stated or convenient times, each

could go into residence at the hall, and either in company with his fellows or following the sense of his own needs, submit himself to a special discipline of prayer, meditation and reading. He would enjoy the peace and rest of the holy precincts, association with the other clergy, and communion with and direction of his Bishop.

There is a spiritual science of religion as well as an intellectual science of religion. Into the mysteries of the former even more than into the questions of the latter, his experience would impel him to enter; while the means thereto in such a place must be vastly greater than in the midst of the work of a parish, and by the aid only of solitary meditation.

Such rest and exercises cannot fail to dissipate morbid tendencies, and restore the equilibrium of the soul. And the clergyman must go back to his parish and flock refreshed and strengthened in his own character, purposes, and resolutions, and better able to serve those committed to his care.

3. In very early times a school for boys was

attached to almost every Cathedral, and was conducted by the Chapter, certain Canons being detailed to the work. Henry the Eighth founded such schools at all the Cathedrals which were without them; most of them survive to this day; some have great renown. They are day schools for the Cathedral towns with limited provision for boarding pupils. They are generally grammar schools and may fit their scholars for the universities.

A branch of the Cathedral school should be for choristers. Their daily training in music and the services in the daily office make it necessary that they should be under constant restraint, discipline and observation, in order to correct evil habits, dispositions and tendencies; so that the bad boy may never enter the sanctuary with holy words on his vile lips, and that the good may be delivered from evil. Boys living in other towns and needing such training, whether fitted by their musical gifts for the choir or not, could easily be provided for in families of the clergy or other Christian peo-

ple; so that while the pupils might be ever so numerous, yet there would be no need of the great and expensive establishment of a boarding school. This is an incidental part of the legitimate work of the Cathedral of very great importance.

4. It is hardly possible to conceive of such a body of clergy as we have described, devoted to these works, and such a laity as would desire their services and give them support, who would not seek out and contrive many ways of doing good to the unfortunate. Our blessed Lord did not give all His time and labor to preaching, meditation and prayer. A large portion was spent in relieving the miseries of poor people and of His friends. It is of the philosophy of religion that work and worship, the services of charity and meditation, go together; and observation teaches us that the most devout seek most the ways of doing good.

The Cathedral life, filled with its own work, must be a life of very high spirituality. They who are devoted to it will, by a law of human

nature be devoted to every work of Christian charity. They will have hospitals for the sick, asylums for the aged poor, homes for children, retreats for the distressed, and every other means and method for ministering to human wants, sorrows, and misfortune. Each will come in its order, and its time; but there will be no contentment until every need is supplied.

5. We have a few words to say of the Cathedral as a school of sacred music. We begin by a few brief excerpts from the book of which, to the great pleasure of our readers we are sure, we have already made use.

"The choral part of the service of the Church (whether it be vocal, or instrumental, or both) is not a mere appendage or ornament, added on from without; it contributes very mainly to the fervor and life, and therefore to the reality, of the service. It would be otherwise, if no faculty but that of the understanding were called into exercise in the worship of God. Speech, mere plain speech, the less ornate the better, is the language of

the understanding. But, if the heart is to be touched, and the emotions stirred by worship, so that the flame of devotion shall kindle up easily, there must be music in some shape or other,—music, at all events, if in no technical form, yet at least in the tones and modulations of a speaker's voice." . . . .

"And here occurs a thought, which, though expressed already, needs to be brought out in sharper relief. It should be distinctly understood and avowed that, whatever may be the case in ordinary parochial churches, the cultivation and performance of anthem music and of services, (as they are called), is part of the business of a Cathedral. That form of Church music will expire, unless it is maintained; and the regular and appropriate place for its maintenance is the mother Church of the diocese. And it is a necessary corollary from this, that in a considerable part of the choral service *in Cathedrals*, the congregation must acquiesce in being *listeners*. It would be out of the question for any congregation, however well they may acquit themselves in chanting Psalms, to

follow *vocally* the services and the anthem. And why should they? Why is not a *mental* following of what is sung sufficient? We are all, clergy and people, to bear our part in the worship of God; and the choir has their special function therein, as the clergy and the people have theirs. Is the idea of any one being a more devout listener to the service offensive? Why should it be so? Is devout listening to a sermon or to the lessons unprofitable? Why should devout listening to a sentence or two of Holy Scripture be rendered less profitable by the circumstance of that sentence being musically rendered, and presented (perhaps) by the music under a new aspect? May we not appeal to our text as an authority for the benefit ensuing upon simple listening? It was by *listening* to the minstrel, that Elisha's soul was brought to such a temper as to be susceptible of an impulse from the spirit of prophesy. It was by submitting himself to the soothing influences of David's harp, that 'Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him.' And

it is by listening with a steady and quiet endeavor, either simply to compose the mind (if the music be merely instrumental), or to send the sense of the words (if it be vocal) into the mind and heart, that we shall reach that end of edification and raised feeling, the attainment of which is a chief end of ecclesiastical music.

"In estimating the *extent* of the work, which our Cathedrals have it in them to do for the promotion of Church music, it must be remembered that music has by no means as yet taken that position in our services which it has a right to take. The minds of people are not at all disabused of the notion that music is a mere ornamental accessory of worship; they have not yet at all come round to the view that it is the truest, highest, deepest expression of devotional feeling. What, for example, would be the criticism made by nine members out of ten in an ordinary congregation, on the introduction of music in the celebration of the Holy Communion—on the singing, say, of the 'sanctus,' and the 'Gloria in excelsis?' Would it not almost infallibly run thus: 'I approve of singing the can-

ticles in the morning and evening prayer; I even approve of chanting the psalms in Cathedrals; but the Holy Communion is something so very solemn, that the introduction of music distracts the mind, and seems to match ill with the occasion.' This is what the majority would say, if they said what they felt; and yet what an absurd anomaly does it seem, when we come to examine the matter on the ground of reason, that into all our lower acts of worship music must be freely admitted; but that from the Christian banquet, the Christian festival, the most jubilant and exulting of all services, of which at its first institution music formed an integral part, (for we are told that our Lord and his disciples 'sung a hymn,' after the institution of the eucharist,) the notes of the organ and the voices of the singers should be (as if such things were a species of desecration) carefully banished! Surely the prevalence of any such feeling denotes that a great advance has yet to be made before our services can be brought up to that standard, to which, with the consent and co-operation of our congregations,

it would be quite practicable to bring them. That consent and co-operation may be obtained, not by introducing, without the assignment of sufficient reasons, sudden and startling changes, thus shocking instincts and associations which have been long in forming; but by quietly keeping pace in our practice with the progress of Christian thought, and the improvements which that thought is rapidly carrying with it. In matters devotional we are all very much the creatures of habit, and resent (naturally enough) the disturbance of our old ways of thinking and acting; but if a practice be in itself proper and reasonable, and its propriety be quietly pointed out, the strangeness soon begins to wear away, until at length we begin to approve, and ultimately become attached to it. It is by no means sufficient to perceive theoretically what is just and right in these matters; great discretion, great patience, great charity to the infirmities of others, and profound submission to lawful authority, are necessary in giving effect to it. At the same time, progress is an indication (and the only

sure indication) of life; and it is to be remembered that if the method of performing the services of our Church should be no more solemn, reverent, and attractive a quarter of a century hence than it is now, the inference would be unfavorable as to the spiritual life and devotion of the present generation."

These words of the pious, wise, and learned Dean add the weight of his authority to the sentiments which they beautifully express; and they suffice for the advocacy of the Cathedral service. There remains one practical question: How can the diocese be served by the Cathedral in respect of Church music? It has been proposed in England to establish the office of Diocesan Precentor, and make him a member of the Chapter; his duty being to superintend musical instruction for the Diocese. I believe that this has actually been done in some of the English Cathedrals. In our country at Denver the choir-master and organist are very accomplished in the art and science of music, and of musical instruction. They have been able to gather large classes of pupils, many of whom

have already had such training as American teachers can give. Their instruction, thorough and extensive, has provided a large choir of men, women and boys. They carry their education farther, and rouse a genuine enthusiasm by the production in the large Cathedral of oratorios and masses. If to this it be objected that, a Church is not the proper place for such exhibitions let the origin of the name, oratorio, be recalled: it was from the oratory of St. Philip Neri in which it was first produced. By means of such exercises, not only is the most emphatic religious instruction given to the people, but persons are trained to the holy office of rendering unto Almighty God a worship, the very highest man can offer, and therefore more nearly worthy of His holy name.

Those trained in such a school and by these splendid exercises, going out into all parts of the diocese, carry with them an elevated taste and an aroused interest, and in their turn teach others what can be done for the worship of God even in the humblest Churches.

VIII.

THE CATHEDRAL AND THE SEE CITY.

WHAT we have been saying has been mostly of the diocesan institution. Were we to stop here the representation would be only of the side which the Cathedral presents towards the wide fields which lie beyond, and mainly far beyond, the community in whose midst the Church and its accessory buildings stand. That is the most interesting view, and to it the attention of American churchmen needs most to be directed. But it is only a partial view. We must not stand fixed and absorbed in our gaze upon the grand façade of tower, buttress, clerestory and transept, as they end in the graceful octagon of the Chapter house, and never pass around to the wide entrance of the western end, through which the worshipers daily enter the sacred courts. If

we content ourselves with the one view, we go away not only having seen but half the glory there, but with a false conception of the perfect whole.

The Cathedral is a diocesan, but it is also a local institution: it has a side towards the See city and special relations to it. We may classify them thus: they are, first, to society; secondly, to the people dependent on its ministrations; and thirdly, to other Churches.

1. The Cathedral has relations to the whole society of the See city besides what it bears to Church people. It is a public, popular, civic institution, as well as an ecclesiastical establishment.

Let us suppose the Cathedral in a city. The building has some pretensions to size, dignity and beauty. It is capable of holding multitudes; the chancel with Bishop and clergy in the midst is resplendent with the majesty of the Christian priesthood; and the choir is full of singing men and women and boys lifting up their voices to the Lord God Almighty. The day is one of the civic

festivals, when all the people are agitated by the common and sublime emotion of patriotism,—the 4th of July, or the 22d of February, or the public Thanksgiving. Or it is a day of mourning as when our armies are turned back in battle, a President is murdered, or the people are plagued by the pestilence that walketh in darkness and destroyeth at noonday. The citizens are bidden to the Cathedral, and there they offer their thanksgivings or their lamentations in such a service as the liturgy of the Church alone can furnish, heightened by the highest art of human voice and instrument of music. Let that happen just once in any city, and what must follow but that the public heart is profoundly moved and the faces of the people turned towards the Church. And when other such days come, the crowds will throng thither as to the fit, accustomed and delightful place where to begin to keep the holy day. It is what no denomination can begin to do, though every appliance of sacred art be exhausted in the effort. The Roman Catholic Church can do

it for her own children but not for strangers to her ritual. Our Church alone is capable of it, and for reasons which any one of our readers will recall without our aid.

Even while we write, in the grandest public festival of our day, her precedence is acknowledged. The Bishop of Long Island in his robes of office with his attendant clergy, in the midst of the innumerable crowds gathered to the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge, is, as every heart admits, the fit and true sacerdotal authority to consecrate the occasion and work. To complete the sacred service, there was but need of a great Cathedral in the city, in which before moving to the majestic structure the municipal and civic authorities and body of the citizens should be gathered, and a grand Te Deum be sung in the ears of them all.

Let it once become the settled order in the See city to draw the citizens to the Cathedral by these civic services, and they will adopt it as theirs, to be fostered and rejoiced in as such, and the Church will once

more begin to take her place among the transcendent forces of society. We need not take time to speak of the service to society which will be rendered by the works of mercy which will be gathered about the Cathedral.

We must pass on to say a few words, secondly, of the relations of the Cathedral to the people dependent on its ministrations. These are of two classes. One is made up of strangers in the See city, and of residents not formally attached to a parish. Their number is always considerable. The necessity of providing for them is as great as the difficulty. The parish Church is not equal to keeping a hold upon them. The young man tarrying in town for a while or making his home there, looks into the door of a Church and sees, by their manner and acquaintance, that those entering there are used to the place; he knows he is not one of them and is shriveled by the chilly sense that he is a stranger. He passes by and never comes back. He may be told that the seats are free, but it is not an abstract right to sit where he will that can attract him: he

must feel that he is not the only stranger but that this is the Church for all such as he. The rector may be ever so vigilant in seeking out strangers and urgent in his invitations to report to him, but he can reach very few of those who do not come to him. And the same is true of visiting committees, brotherhoods, and other such appliances. They do not reach the case. Everybody feels that for some reason or other there is a failure to reach and deal well with these people.

The Cathedral is fitted to meet the exigency. It has an attractive and impressive ritual. It has several services, some not largely frequented, at least not by many of those who put a constraint on any one. It enforces a laxity of claim and an equality of right beyond what free sittings give to all comers, while in its wide spaces is ample room for the largest numbers. The mere fact of precedence will generally so draw occasional worshipers that each will feel that he is one of a throng. And thus it will be the home of the stranger, and the

stranger though he be but the solitary boy we have been speaking of, will feel at home.

The other class dependent on the ministrations of the Cathedral, is made up of those who are wont to find within its walls their spiritual home, and who resort to its clergy for spiritual care. There will be a regular congregation of persons of this class.

And this congregation differing in many ways from those of the parishes and called on for large contributions, present many problems of difficulty. The question is not about their pastoral oversight. Formerly, as we have seen, it was usual to charge a particular Canon or Vicar Choral with that service; and it is not unlike that of a parish priest over his people. So that there is no difference or not much difference in this respect between the Cathedral and the parish, save in the name and style of the clergyman who is the pastor of the people. The trouble lies in fixing organic relations. Shall the congregation be an unorganized body of Christian worshipers, each

content with his individual place, worship and service, without interest in the administration of the particular society or of the Church at large; or shall it be organized as a separate, independent, corporate body with rights and duties and powers of its own in which each worshiper shall have a part? Here is a difficulty.

We have seen that the Bishoprics recently erected in England are provided with Cathedrals by the adoption of parish Churches for the purpose; that in Canada the general policy is that of the Cathedral superimposed on the parish; and that in many American dioceses the same polity obtains. This has been, and, so far as it remains, it still is a mere expedient. All feel its insecurity and inadequacy and look forward to outgrowing it. The reason is that the parish being the corporation, and as such legally vested with the title to the property and with its administration, it may, in any case of disagreement with the Bishop or Chapter or diocesan authorities, determine the relation.

We are not without more than one instance of this. One was the unhappy issue which sprung up between a former Bishop of Montreal and the rector of Christ Church. The particular matters of difference were not of great importance; but his lordship put his wishes and views forward, and when they were not readily and altogether accepted, he insisted upon them as of right. The rector, on the other hand, professing a desire to accommodate himself to the views of the Bishop, felt that the admission of his claims would be drawn into precedent, and therefore it was a duty which he owed to his office and to those who should come after him to defend his legal and corporate rights uncompromisingly. Our question here is not as to the right of either side or of the special matter of disagreement, but with the mere circumstance that a grave issue of principle was raised upon the official prerogatives of the parties.

No undefined, uncertain system can withstand the shock of such controversies. And

they are almost certain to come. Tact may delay and concession may avert them for a while, but pretensions, claims, and demands grow so rapidly when unresisted that the end is certain. The only wise course is to anticipate disagreements by the surrender of the parish to the Cathedral.

But here at once other difficulties present themselves. Avoiding the parish for the sake of unity and to escape the friction of diverse interests and forces, the Chapter cannot afford to cast out the active, manifold, hearty and constant assistance of the laity of the congregation. The necessity of revenues to be raised at short intervals out of the members remits the clergy to their aid; and even when these are well provided, the general care of the temporalities may best be entrusted to the laity. But what shall be the organization of the body to be charged with these duties? Bishop Sweatman's scheme is the election of four lay members of the Chapter by the clerical and four by the lay delegates to the

diocesan synod. Bishop Perry's scheme is the appointment by himself of curators of the Cathedral. Both are competent plans except that they leave the congregation without voice in the administration of affairs which chiefly concern itself. Or if respect be paid to it, by the choice of these laymen from its members it still remains without right to enforce its judgments and wishes. The Denver scheme is the annual election, by the congregation, of lay Canons to whom, with the Bishop and Dean, the temporalities are entrusted. This seems more thoroughly to meet the exigency. The whole matter is one to be dealt with in every place by the wisdom of those who are framing their plans of organization. It is further but right that the Cathedral congregation should have the same representation as a parish in the diocesan council: it may be fair and wise even to give it a larger delegation.

The relations of the Cathedral to parishes in the See city present questions of great delicacy. It is not possible to define them

in canons or statutes, so as to satisfy the many conflicting opinions which are certain to obtain among very intelligent and earnest churchmen. In the earlier ages, before the Chapter had become a compact, consistent and exclusive corporation, all the clergy of the See city surrounded the Bishop and yielded to him the service which became due from the latter body. It would be a partial return to this system to make all the priests of the See city members of the Chapter. In cities of the first class this is impracticable; in others it may be liable to inconveniences. And yet it may be well worth while to consider whether, in cities where the number of parishes is not too great, the bringing of all the clergy together to deliberate upon the interests of the Church may not tend to mollify and temper asperities, which are apt to come rather from ignorance of one another than from actual disagreements. At Davenport and Denver the attempt has been made to gain unity by subordinating the parishes to the Cathe-

dral. The experiment will be watched with anxious curiosity.

It is judicious that missions in the city and works of mercy of the diocese should proceed from the Cathedral and be under the direction of the Chapter. This is no infringement of the rights of the parishes. Certainly this must be so, where, under the authority of the canons of the general convention the diocesan councils have not provided for the establishment of new churches or congregations, within the limits of other parishes and the Bishop is in accord with his Chapter. More reasons than one could be urged in behalf of this policy. Our purpose is sufficiently answered by stating the matter.

The whole of this delicate matter of the relations of the Cathedral to the parishes is one to be dealt with on all sides as far above narrow jealousies, and as by those who "shall be refreshed in the multitude of peace."